arXiv:1407.2792v3 [math.AP] 15 Oct 2015

IMPERMEABILITY THROUGH A PERFORATED DOMAIN FOR THE INCOMPRESSIBLE 2D EULER EQUATIONS

CHRISTOPHE LACAVE & NADER MASMOUDI

Abstract. We study the asymptotic behavior of the motion of an ideal incompressible fluid in a perforated domain. The porous medium is composed of inclusions of size ε separated by distances d_ε and the fluid fills the exterior.

If the inclusions are distributed on the unit square, the asymptotic behavior depends on the limit of $\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}$ when ε goes to zero. If $\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \to \infty$, then the limit motion is not perturbed by the porous medium, namely we recover the Euler solution in the whole space. On the contrary, if $\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \to 0$, then the fluid cannot penetrate the porous region, namely the limit velocity verifies the Euler equations in the exterior of an impermeable square.

If the inclusions are distributed on the unit segment then the behavior depends on the geometry of the inclusion: it is determined by the limit of $\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{2+\frac{1}{\gamma}}}$ where $\gamma \in (0, \infty]$ is related to the geometry of the lateral boundaries of the obstacles. If $\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{2+\frac{1}{\gamma}}} \to \infty$, then the presence of holes is not felt at the limit, whereas an impermeable wall appears if this limit is zero. Therefore, for a distribution in one direction, the critical distance depends on the shape of the inclusions. In particular it is equal to ε^3 for balls.

Keywords: Asymptotic analysis, porous medium, critical distance between the holes.
MSC: 35Q31, 35Q35, 76B99.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
1.1. The perforated domain 2
1.2. The Euler equations and former results 3
1.3. Main result 4
2. Proof of convergence 8
2.1. A priori estimates for Euler solutions 8
2.2. Convergence for large distance 9
2.3. Convergence for small distance 11
3. Permeability for large distance 15
3.1. Construction of the correction 15
3.2. Cell problem estimates 16
3.3. Optimal cutoff function 19
4. Impermeability for small distance 22
4.1. Inclusions distributed on the segment 22
4.2. Inclusions distributed on the square 24
5. Final remarks and comments 26
5.1. Weaker assumptions on the shape 26
5.2. Infinite number of lines shrinking to the segment 28
5.3. Non-uniform continuity of the Leray projection 29
5.4. Paradox with the Kelvin theorem 29
References 30

Date: October 16, 2015.

1. Introduction

The problem studied in this paper is the behavior of the 2D Euler equations in a porous medium. Although very natural, this problem was studied in very few mathematical papers. Most papers have focused on the Laplace equation [8], on Stokes and Navier-Stokes flows [1, 29, 32, 34]. Recently, more attention was given to the homogenization of other fluid models such as the compressible Navier-Stokes system [11, 27] and the acoustic system [4, 12].

Concerning the incompressible Euler system, noticeable exceptions are the works [25, 30], on a weakly nonlinear Euler flow through a regular grid (balls of radius ε, at distance ε from one another). In this context, a non-trivial limit is obtained as ε goes to zero.

In the spirit of [2] where the limit was studied for holes which are larger or smaller than the critical sizes of the holes, we have obtained in [5] a condition such that the ideal incompressible fluid does not feel the presence of the small inclusions. Our goal here is to complete the study started in [5]. We improve the critical distance obtained in [5] and we prove that below this distance an impermeable boundary appears.

When the inclusions are distributed in one direction, an important difference with the result about the Stokes and Laplace equations is that the critical value depends on the shape of the inclusions and corresponds to very close inclusions (at distance ε^3 for disks distributed on a segment whereas the inclusions are separated by $1/|\ln\varepsilon|$ in [2]). Even if physically, it appears natural that the critical distance for a viscous fluid is larger than for an inviscid flow, it was not clear mathematically because the Euler equations is related to a Laplace problem $\Delta\psi = \omega$ where ω is the vorticity (which is bounded) and ψ the stream function: the velocity verifying $u = \nabla^\perp\psi$. Of course, the main difference lies in the boundary condition.

1.1. The perforated domain.

We denote the shape of the inclusions by $\mathcal{K}$ and the standard assumption is:

(H1): $\mathcal{K} \subset [-1,1]^2$ is a simply-connected compact set of $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\partial K \in C^{1,\beta}$ for $\beta > 0$ is a Jordan curve.

We consider the case where the inclusions have the same shape:

$$\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon_{i,j} := z^\varepsilon_{i,j} + \tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathcal{K}, \tag{1.1}$$

where the points $z^\varepsilon_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ should be fixed in order that the inclusions are disjoints. We assume that the inclusions of size ε are at least separated by a distance d_ε. Namely, for $i,j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, we define

$$z^\varepsilon_{i,j} := (\tfrac{\varepsilon}{2} + (i-1)(\varepsilon + d_\varepsilon), (j-1)(\varepsilon + d_\varepsilon)) = (\tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}, 0) + (\varepsilon + d_\varepsilon)(i-1, j-1). \tag{1.2}$$

In the horizontal direction, we consider the maximal number of inclusions that we can distribute on the unit segment $[0,1]$ (see Figure 1), hence we consider

$$i = 1, \dots, N_\varepsilon \text{ in (1.1)-(1.2)},$$

with

$$N_\varepsilon = \left[\frac{1 + d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon + d_\varepsilon}\right]$$

(where $[x]$ denotes the integer part of x).



Figure 1. Inclusions along the unit segment.

In the vertical direction, we will consider two situations:

- inclusions covering the unit square, namely
$$j = 1, \dots, N_\varepsilon \text{ in (1.1)-(1.2);}$$
- inclusions concentrated on the unit segment, namely
$$j = 1 \text{ in (1.1)-(1.2).}$$

When the obstacles are distributed only in one direction, the critical distance will be much smaller than the size, and the geometry of the lateral boundaries of the inclusion will play a crucial role. We assume that the distance between $\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon_{i,1}$ and $\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon_{i+1,1}$ is reached for $z^\varepsilon_{i,1}+(\frac{\varepsilon}{2},0)$ and $z^\varepsilon_{i+1,1}-(\frac{\varepsilon}{2},0)$. Namely, we assume that $(\pm 1, 0) \in \partial\mathcal{K}$, which implies that the distance between two inclusions is d_ε:
$$\mathrm{d}\Big(\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon_{i,1}, \mathcal{K}^\varepsilon_{i+1,1}\Big) = \mathrm{d}\Big(z^\varepsilon_{i,1} + (\tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}, 0), z^\varepsilon_{i+1,1} - (\tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}, 0)\Big) = d_\varepsilon.$$
Of course, we could replace this condition by $(\pm 1, s) \in \partial\mathcal{K}$, for some $s \in [-1, 1]$.

We recall that if the boundary $\partial\mathcal{K}$ is locally parametrized around $(1, 0)$ by
$$x = 1 - \rho|y|^{1+\gamma}$$
with $\rho, \gamma > 0$, then γ is called the tangency exponent in [7, 31]. More generally, let us assume that

(H2): there exist $\rho_0 \in (0, 1)$, $\rho_1, \rho_2 > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0, \infty]$ such that
- the segment $[-(1 - \rho_1|s|^{1+\gamma}), (1 - \rho_1|s|^{1+\gamma})] \times \{s\} \subset \mathcal{K}$ for all $s \in [-\rho_0, \rho_0]$;
- the set $\mathcal{K} \cap (\mathbb{R} \times \{s\}) \subset [-(1 - \rho_2|s|^{1+\gamma}), (1 - \rho_2|s|^{1+\gamma})] \times \{s\}$ for all $s \in [-1, 1]$.

In particular, (H2) encodes the fact that $(\pm 1, 0) \in \partial\mathcal{K}$, which will be used when the inclusions are distributed on the segment. For inclusions covering the square, our main result is independent of ρ_0, ρ_1 and γ, but we will need $(\pm 1, 0), (0, \pm 1) \in \partial\mathcal{K}$ (see Section 5.1 for possible extensions).

For example, if the inclusion is the unit ball, $\partial\mathcal{K}$ is locally parametrized around $(1, 0)$ by $(\sqrt{1 - s^2}, s) \sim_0 (1 - \frac{1}{2}s^2, s)$, i.e. we can choose in this case $\gamma = 1$ (with $\rho_2 < 1/2 < \rho_1$). Note that $\gamma = \infty$ corresponds to the case where the solid is flat near $(\pm 1, 0)$: $[(1, -\rho_0), (1, \rho_0)] \subset \partial\mathcal{K}$.

Let us note that γ does not correspond to the radius of curvature R_c: for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ the radius $R_c = 0$, for $\gamma \in (1, \infty]$ we have $R_c = \infty$, and for $\gamma = 1$ we compute $R_c = 1/(2\rho)$.

Throughout the paper, the fluid domain will be the exterior of the inclusions:
$$\Omega^\varepsilon_2 := \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{i=1}^{N_\varepsilon} \bigcup_{j=1}^{N_\varepsilon} \mathcal{K}^\varepsilon_{i,j} \Big), \tag{1.3}$$
or
$$\Omega^\varepsilon_1 := \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{i=1}^{N_\varepsilon} \mathcal{K}^\varepsilon_{i,1} \Big). \tag{1.4}$$

1.2. **The Euler equations and former results.** The velocity $u^\varepsilon := (u^\varepsilon_1, u^\varepsilon_2)(t, x)$ of an ideal incompressible fluid filling a domain Ω^ε is governed by the Euler equations
$$\partial_t u^\varepsilon + u^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla u^\varepsilon = -\nabla p^\varepsilon, \qquad (t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times \Omega^\varepsilon; \tag{1.5}$$
$$\operatorname{div} u^\varepsilon = 0, \qquad (t, x) \in [0, \infty) \times \Omega^\varepsilon; \tag{1.6}$$
$$u^\varepsilon \cdot n = 0, \qquad (t, x) \in [0, \infty) \times \partial\Omega^\varepsilon; \tag{1.7}$$
$$u^\varepsilon(0, \cdot) = u^\varepsilon_0, \qquad x \in \Omega^\varepsilon, \tag{1.8}$$
where p^ε is the pressure. In dimension two, the natural quantity for these equations is the vorticity:
$$\omega^\varepsilon := \operatorname{curl} u^\varepsilon = \partial_1 u^\varepsilon_2 - \partial_2 u^\varepsilon_1$$
because taking formally the curl of (1.5), we note that ω^ε verifies a transport equation:
$$\partial_t \omega^\varepsilon + u^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \omega^\varepsilon = 0, \quad (t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times \Omega^\varepsilon. \tag{1.9}$$

In smooth domains, the well-posedness of the Euler equations was established long time ago: the existence and uniqueness of global strong solution for smooth initial data is a result of Wolibner [35],

whereas the existence and uniqueness of global weak solutions for initial data with bounded vorticity was obtained by Yudovich [36] (see Kikuchi [17] for exterior domains).

To fix an initial data for all ε, the standard way is to fix an initial vorticity $\omega_0 \in L^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^2)$ (i.e. ω_0 bounded and compactly supported) and to consider the unique initial velocity u_0^ε such that:

$$\begin{gathered}\operatorname{div} u_0^\varepsilon = 0 \text{ in } \Omega^\varepsilon, \quad \operatorname{curl} u_0^\varepsilon = \omega_0 \text{ in } \Omega^\varepsilon, \quad u_0^\varepsilon \cdot n = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega^\varepsilon, \\ \lim_{|x|\to\infty} u_0^\varepsilon(x) = 0, \quad \oint_{\partial \mathcal{K}_{i,j}^\varepsilon} u_0^\varepsilon \cdot \tau \, ds = 0 \text{ for all } i,j.\end{gathered} \tag{1.10}$$

The goal of this article is to determine the limit of the Euler solutions when ε and d_ε tend to zero. More precisely, depending on the distribution of the inclusions, we prove the convergence to the solution of Euler in the whole plane, in the exterior of the unit segment or in the exterior of the unit square.

The asymptotic behavior of the Euler equations around inclusions which shrink to points was the subject of several recent works: the case of one shrinking obstacle in the whole plane [16], of one shrinking obstacle in a bounded domain [26], of an infinite number of shrinking disks [21]. In all these works, the authors have also treated the case where the initial circulations are non zero, which adds some difficulties and provides interesting asymptotics. Nevertheless, in all these cases the distance between the obstacles is large, and if the initial circulations are zero, the theorems therein can be understood by stating that the limit motion is not perturbed by the shrinking inclusions.

1.3. **Main result.** In [5] we have looked for the distances $d_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\alpha$ between obstacles ($\alpha > 0$) for which we do not feel the presence of the inclusions. We have proved therein that for $\alpha < 1$ when inclusions cover the square and for $\alpha < 2$ when inclusions are distributed in one direction, then the solutions $(u^\varepsilon, \omega^\varepsilon)$ of the Euler equations on Ω^ε with initial velocity u_0^ε (1.10) converge to the unique global solution to the Euler equations in the whole plane $\mathbb{R}^2$, with initial vorticity ω_0.

When inclusions cover the square, the first goal of this paper is to observe, for $\alpha > 1$, the presence of an impermeable square at the limit, i.e. we get $u \cdot n = 0$ on the boundary of the square, no matter what the geometry of the inclusions is.

When inclusions are distributed on the segment, we will prove in the second theorem that the critical value of α depends on the geometry:

$$\alpha_c(\gamma) = 2 + \frac{1}{\gamma}.$$

For instance:

- if inclusions are asymptotically vertically flat ($\gamma = \infty$ in (H2)), an impermeable segment appears for $\alpha > \alpha_c(\infty) = 2$;
- for circular inclusions, we prove the impermeability of the porous medium for $\alpha > \alpha_c(1) = 3$ and prove permeability for $\alpha < \alpha_c(1) = 3$ improving the analysis performed in [5].

A main novelty of this work is to show that the critical distance depends on the geometry of the inclusions (in the case of a segment), which is not the case for the Laplace, Stokes and Navier-Stokes problems.

Another slight improvement compared to [5], included here, is to consider more general d_ε than power of ε. This requires us to be more precise and not even losing some *log* in some of the estimates in Section 3.

1.3.1. *Case of the square.* When the inclusions cover a square, the criterion is independent of the geometry:

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $\mathcal{K}$ verifies* (H1)*. Let $\omega_0 \in L^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $(u^\varepsilon, \omega^\varepsilon)$ be the global weak solution to the Euler equations* (1.5)-(1.9) *on*

$$\Omega_2^\varepsilon = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{i=1}^{N_\varepsilon} \bigcup_{j=1}^{N_\varepsilon} \mathcal{K}_{i,j}^\varepsilon \Big) \quad \textit{(with } \mathcal{K}_{i,j}^\varepsilon \textit{ defined in } (1.1)\text{-}(1.2)\textit{)},$$

with initial vorticity $\omega_0|_{\Omega^\varepsilon}$ and initial circulations 0 *around the inclusions (see* (1.10)*).*

(i) *If*

$$\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \to \infty \quad \text{for a sequence } \varepsilon \to 0$$

then

- $u^\varepsilon \to u$ *strongly in* $L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^2)$ *and* $\omega^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \omega$ *weak* $*$ *in* $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^2)$*;*
- *the limit pair* (u, ω) *is the unique global solution to the Euler equations in the whole plane* $\mathbb{R}^2$*, with initial vorticity* ω_0*.*

(ii) *If*

$$\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \to 0 \quad \text{for a sequence } \varepsilon \to 0$$

and that $(\pm 1, 0), (0, \pm 1) \in \partial\mathcal{K}$*, then there exists a subsequence such that*

- $u^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u$ *weak* $*$ *in* $L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus [0,1]^2))$ *and* $\omega^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \omega$ *weak* $*$ *in* $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+ \times (\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus [0,1]^2))$*;*
- *the limit pair* (u, ω) *is a global weak solution to the Euler equations in* $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus [0,1]^2$*, with* $u \cdot n = 0$ *on the boundary, with initial vorticity* ω_0 *and initial circulation* 0 *around the square.*

The tangency condition is verified where n is defined, i.e. on the boundary of the square except the corners: for all $x \in \Big((0,1) \times \{0,1\}\Big) \cup \Big(\{0,1\} \times (0,1)\Big)$. Let us note that it does not imply that the velocity vanishes at the corners, because the velocity may blow up near the corners (see Remark 2.6 for more details).

The situation

$$\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \to C > 0,$$

is related to the problem considered in [25, 30]. In these works, the authors considered the case where the inclusions cover a bounded domain $\widetilde{\Omega}$ with $d_\varepsilon = \varepsilon$. As there are inclusions everywhere in the fluid domain, they have assumed that the velocity is small $u^\varepsilon = \varepsilon \tilde{u}^\varepsilon$ and studied the limit when $\tilde{u}^\varepsilon$ verifies a weakly non-linear equation

$$\partial_t \tilde{u}^\varepsilon + \varepsilon \tilde{u}^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}^\varepsilon = -\nabla \tilde{p}^\varepsilon.$$

Using the notion of two-scale convergence, they obtained that the limit of $\tilde{u}^\varepsilon$ verifies an homogenized system which couples a cell problem with the macroscopic one.

1.3.2. *Case of the segment.* When the inclusions are distributed only in one direction, the critical distance is much smaller than the size, and depends on the exponent γ of the lateral boundaries of the obstacle. Namely, the result reads as follows

Theorem 1.2. *Assume that* $\mathcal{K}$ *verifies* (H1)-(H2) *with* $\gamma \in (0, \infty]$*. Let* $\omega_0 \in L^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^2)$ *and* $(u^\varepsilon, \omega^\varepsilon)$ *be the global weak solution to the Euler equations* (1.5)-(1.9) *on*

$$\Omega_1^\varepsilon = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{i=1}^{N_\varepsilon} \mathcal{K}_{i,1}^\varepsilon \Big) \quad \text{(with } \mathcal{K}_{i,j}^\varepsilon \text{ defined in (1.1)-(1.2))},$$

with initial vorticity $\omega_0|_{\Omega^\varepsilon}$ *and initial circulations* 0 *around the inclusions (see* (1.10)*).*

(i) *If*

$$\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{2+\frac{1}{\gamma}}} \to \infty \quad \text{for a sequence } \varepsilon \to 0$$

then

- $u^\varepsilon \to u$ *strongly in* $L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^2)$ *and* $\omega^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \omega$ *weak* $*$ *in* $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^2)$*;*
- *the limit pair* (u, ω) *is the unique global solution to the Euler equations in the whole plane* $\mathbb{R}^2$*, with initial vorticity* ω_0*.*

(ii) *If*

$$\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{2+\frac{1}{\gamma}}} \to 0 \quad \text{for a sequence } \varepsilon \to 0$$

then there exists a subsequence such that

- $u^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u$ *weak* $*$ *in* $L^\infty_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus ([0,1]\times\{0\})))$ *and* $\omega^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \omega$ *weak* $*$ *in* $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+ \times (\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus ([0,1]\times\{0\})))$*;*
- *the limit pair* (u,ω) *is a global weak solution to the Euler equations in* $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus ([0,1]\times\{0\})$*, with* $u\cdot n = 0$ *on the boundary, with initial vorticity* ω_0 *and initial circulation* 0 *around the segment.*

The tangency condition is verified on both sides of the segment, except at the endpoints where the velocity may blow up (see Remark 2.6). As it will be explained just below Remark 2.6, the explicit behavior of u_0 gives the integrability of the trace and the circulation $\oint_{\partial(\mathbb{R}^2\setminus([0,1]\times\{0\}))} u_0\cdot\tau\, ds$ should be understood as the integral on the upper value $\int_0^1 u_0^{up}\cdot(-e_1)$ plus the lower value $\int_0^1 u_0^{down}\cdot e_1$.

Remark 1.3. *The extraction of a subsequence appears only in Section 2, due to general compactness results (namely, we apply the Banach-Alaoglu's theorem to the vorticity).*

In the case (i) of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, we recover at the limit the solution of the Euler equations in the whole plane. By the Yudovich's theorem, this solution is unique and we do not need to extract a subsequence.

Unfortunately, the uniqueness result is a hard issue in the exterior of the square or the segment, because in such domains, the velocity does not belong to $\cap_{p\in[2,\infty)} W^{1,p}$*. Actually,* u *is not even bounded and blows up in the vicinity of the corners (like* $1/\sqrt{|x|}$ *close to the endpoints of the segment and like* $1/|x|^{1/3}$ *close to the corners of a square). We refer to* [20] *for partial results in this setting.*

The weak $*$ *limit for* u^ε *in the case (ii) is not enough to pass to the limit in the non-linear term* $(u^\varepsilon\otimes u^\varepsilon):\nabla\psi$ *(or* $\omega^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla\varphi$ *in the vorticity formulation), and we will establish later (see Step 4 in Section 2.3) that for any* $T>0$ *and* $\mathcal{O}\Subset\mathbb{R}^2\setminus[0,1]^2$ *(or* $\mathcal{O}\Subset\mathbb{R}^2\setminus([0,1]\times\{0\})$*), we have*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}}u^\varepsilon \to \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}}u \text{ strongly in } L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\mathcal{O})),$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}}$ *is the Leray projector.*

The main novelty of this theorem is to get a criterion which depends on the geometry of the inclusions. This is natural because the distance is much smaller than the size of the holes.

For the Laplace, Stokes and Navier-Stokes problem in dimension two with Dirichlet boundary condition, the critical criterion separating between impermeability and permeability is whether $d_\varepsilon\sqrt{|\ln\varepsilon|}$ goes to ∞ or 0 when inclusions cover a bounded domain $\widetilde{\Omega}$ and whether $d_\varepsilon|\ln\varepsilon|$ goes to ∞ or 0 when they are distributed in one direction. For these systems, the main argument is an energy argument. Roughly, to prove the convergence of u^ε to the solution u of the Laplace problem in the whole domain, one introduces $W^\varepsilon = u^\varepsilon - \varphi^\varepsilon u$ where φ^ε is a cutoff function vanishing at the boundaries of the inclusions. To pass to the limit in the weak formulation, the main difficulty is to study terms like $\int\nabla(\varphi^\varepsilon u):\nabla(\varphi^\varepsilon\psi)$ where ψ is a test function. Choosing the cutoff function which minimize the L^2 norm of the gradient (see Remark 3.1), we find

$$\|\nabla\varphi^\varepsilon\|_{L^2} = \frac{C}{d_\varepsilon^\mu\sqrt{|\ln\varepsilon|}}$$

with $\mu=1$ if the inclusions are distributed on a surface and $\mu=1/2$ for a distribution on a curve. Therefore, for inclusions covering a bounded domain $\widetilde{\Omega}$ and when $d_\varepsilon\sqrt{|\ln\varepsilon|}\to C>0$, we obtain at the limit an homogenized system: see Cioranescu-Murat [8] for the Laplace equation and Allaire [1] for the Stokes and Navier-Stokes systems. If $d_\varepsilon\sqrt{|\ln\varepsilon|}\to\infty$, Allaire has proved in [2] that the limit is not perturbed by the porous medium, and he has also proved the homogenized phenomenon (a Brinkmann-type law) when $d_\varepsilon|\ln\varepsilon|\to C>0$ for inclusions distributed on a curve.

Let us note that the case $d_\varepsilon|\ln\varepsilon|\to 0$ for inclusions distributed on a curve is not treated by Allaire [2]. With smaller distance than the critical value, he only considered the case of inclusions covering a bounded domain $\widetilde{\Omega}$, and as there are inclusions everywhere, the velocity is assumed small and he gets a limit for the quantity $u^\varepsilon/d_\varepsilon\sqrt{|\ln\varepsilon|}$ in order to pass to the limit in the term of the type

$$\int\nabla\left(\frac{u^\varepsilon}{d_\varepsilon\sqrt{|\ln\varepsilon|}}\right):(d_\varepsilon\sqrt{|\ln\varepsilon|}\nabla\varphi^\varepsilon\otimes\psi).$$

In this setting, he obtained Darcy's law at the limit. Actually, Allaire needs to assume that the size of the holes is still smaller than the inter-hole distance (see [2, Equation (3.4.2)]), hence the case $\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \to 0$ in our main results is also a novelty of the present paper and [5].

For inclusions distributed on a curve, there are also many works in the periodic setting $d_\varepsilon = \varepsilon$ (through grids, sieves or porous walls) we refer e.g. to [9, 10, 33].

The reminder of this paper is composed of four parts. In the following section, we reduce our problem to a time-independent problem. First, we derive some a priori estimates which allow us to pass to the limit far away from the porous medium. Next, we write two key propositions dealing with the behavior of divergence free vector fields in a porous medium. We will prove that these propositions imply Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

The core of our analysis is the proof of these two propositions where the quantities $\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}$ (for the square) and $\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{2+\frac{1}{\gamma}}}$ (for the segment) will appear naturally as critical quantities to get permeability vs impermeability.

In Section 3, we prove Proposition 2.3 concerning permeability for inclusions separated by large enough distances. We will follow therein the strategy in [5], which is somehow related to homogenization ideas. The cell problem is the exterior of one inclusion where the velocity verifies the tangency condition. We introduce and study a correction of the solution in the whole plane. This correction is based on the explicit Green kernel formula in the exterior of one simply connected compact set, via Riemann mappings. To localize our formula, we need to truncate the stream function by introducing some cutoff functions φ^ε and we will discuss the optimal choice of φ^ε.

Section 4 deals with Proposition 2.5 concerning impermeability for inclusions separated by small enough distances. To prove that a wall appears, the main point is to get the impermeability condition on the boundary of the porous medium. The approach is totally different from the permeability case. Here, we use an L^2 argument and the computation of the area between two obstacles, which depends on the coefficient γ. Indeed, for small distance, it makes sense, physically, that the fluid crosses easier between circular inclusions ($\gamma = 1$) than between squares ($\gamma = \infty$).

Finally, Section 5 is dedicated to further discussions. We will give some extensions on the inclusion geometry where our results hold. For instance, note that $\gamma = 0$ in (H2) would correspond to the case where $\partial\mathcal{K}$ is a corner of angle 2Arctan $\frac{1}{\rho_1}$, which would not verify $\partial\mathcal{K} \in C^1$. This case is not treated in the main theorems, and we refer to Section 5.1 for a discussion about inclusions with corners. We do not treat the case of a cusp, where we could only take $\gamma \in (-1, 0)$. Section 5 contains also a consequence on the Leray projection: we deduce from our analysis that the Leray projection is not uniformly continuous from L^p to L^p (with $p \in [1, 2)$) in porous medium where $d_\varepsilon \ll \varepsilon$.

If it appears natural that the critical distance is smaller for ideal fluid than for viscous fluid, this is not so clear mathematically. We could argue that the Euler equations and the Laplace, Stokes or Navier-Stokes problems are not at same order, but in practical, the velocity comes from a Laplace problem $\Delta\psi^\varepsilon = \omega_0$ where ψ^ε is the stream function, and we are looking for L^2 estimates of $\nabla^\perp\psi^\varepsilon = u_0^\varepsilon$. Then, we could think that the difference comes from the boundary condition and that the tangency and the zero circulation conditions are less restricting for ideal fluid than the Dirichlet boundary condition for viscous fluid. Nevertheless, this is not a sufficient justification: Allaire showed in [3] that the scaling is the same for Navier-Stokes equations for the two types of boundary conditions (Dirichlet/Robin). We finish this introduction by referring to a recent result of Lacave and Mazzucato [22], where one considers the limit of the porous medium together with the vanishing viscosity problem.

Notations: throughout the paper, Ω_2^ε denotes the exterior domain when inclusions are distributed in the two directions (1.3) whereas Ω_1^ε concerns the case of inclusions distributed in one direction (1.4). We will use the notation Ω^ε when an argument holds for both Ω_1^ε and Ω_2^ε. For shortness, we also denote the exterior of the unit square and of the unit segment by

$$\Omega_2 := \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus [0,1]^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_1 := \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus ([0,1] \times \{0\}),$$

and Ω for arguments holding for both.

2. Proof of convergence

In this section, we derive some standard a priori estimates for solutions of the Euler equations. Next, we give the two key propositions and we prove that Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 will follow.

2.1. **A priori estimates for Euler solutions.** Let $\omega_0 \in L^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be given. By standard results related to the Hodge-De Rham theorem, there exists a unique vector fields $u_0^\varepsilon \in L^2_{\rm loc}(\overline{\Omega^\varepsilon})$ verifying (1.10) (see e.g. [17] for a proof in smooth domain and [15] for any irregular domain).

Let us denote

$$\omega_0^\varepsilon := \omega_0 \mathbb{1}_{\Omega^\varepsilon}$$

then the vector field defined in the whole plane

$$K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega_0^\varepsilon](x) := \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{(x-y)^\perp}{|x-y|^2}\omega_0^\varepsilon(y)\,dy$$

is the unique solution of

$$\operatorname{div} K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega_0^\varepsilon] = 0, \quad \operatorname{curl} K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega_0^\varepsilon] = \omega_0^\varepsilon, \quad \lim_{|x|\to\infty} K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega_0^\varepsilon](x) = 0.$$

We choose R so that $\partial\Omega^\varepsilon \subset B(0,R)$, and χ a smooth cutoff function such that $\chi \equiv 0$ in $B(0,R)$ and $\chi \equiv 1$ in $B(0,R+1)^c$. On the one hand, as ω_0 is compactly supported, we have

$$\widehat{u}_0^\varepsilon := K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega_0^\varepsilon] - \frac{\int \omega_0^\varepsilon}{2\pi}\nabla^\perp(\chi \ln|x|) \text{ is uniformly bounded in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^2).$$

This vector field satisfies:

$$\operatorname{div}\widehat{u}_0^\varepsilon = 0 \text{ in } \Omega^\varepsilon, \quad \operatorname{curl}\widehat{u}_0^\varepsilon = \omega_0 - \frac{\int \omega_0^\varepsilon}{2\pi}\Delta(\chi\ln|x|) \text{ in } \Omega^\varepsilon,$$

$$\lim_{|x|\to\infty}\widehat{u}_0^\varepsilon(x) = 0, \quad \oint_{\partial\mathcal{K}_{i,j}^\varepsilon} \widehat{u}_0^\varepsilon\cdot\tau\,ds = 0 \text{ for all } i,j,$$

where we have used that $\oint_{\partial\mathcal{K}_{i,j}^\varepsilon} K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega_0^\varepsilon]\cdot\tau\,ds = \int_{\mathcal{K}_{i,j}^\varepsilon}\omega_0^\varepsilon = 0$ (Stokes formula).

On the other hand, the vector field

$$\widetilde{u}_0^\varepsilon := u_0^\varepsilon - \frac{\int\omega_0^\varepsilon}{2\pi}\nabla^\perp(\chi\ln|x|)$$

verifies

$$\operatorname{div}\widetilde{u}_0^\varepsilon = 0 \text{ in } \Omega^\varepsilon, \quad \operatorname{curl}\widetilde{u}_0^\varepsilon = \omega_0 - \frac{\int\omega_0^\varepsilon}{2\pi}\Delta(\chi\ln|x|) \text{ in } \Omega^\varepsilon, \quad \widetilde{u}_0^\varepsilon\cdot n = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega^\varepsilon,$$

$$\lim_{|x|\to\infty}\widetilde{u}_0^\varepsilon(x) = 0, \quad \oint_{\partial\mathcal{K}_{i,j}^\varepsilon}\widetilde{u}_0^\varepsilon\cdot\tau\,ds = 0 \text{ for all } i,j,$$

which implies that $\widetilde{u}_0^\varepsilon$ is the Leray projection[1] of $\widehat{u}_0^\varepsilon$. By orthogonality of this projection in L^2, we get that

$$\|\widetilde{u}_0^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \le \|\widehat{u}_0^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \text{ is uniformly bounded.} \tag{2.1}$$

For every ε, it is well-known that there exists a global weak solution

$$u^\varepsilon \in L^\infty_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2_{\rm loc}(\overline{\Omega^\varepsilon})) \quad \text{and} \quad \omega^\varepsilon \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^1\cap L^\infty(\Omega^\varepsilon))$$

to the Euler equations (1.5)-(1.9) (see [17] for smooth domain and [14] for irregular domain). The weak formulation of (1.5) and (1.8) reads:

$$\int_0^\infty\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon} u^\varepsilon\cdot\partial_t\phi\,dxdt + \int_0^\infty\int_\Omega (u^\varepsilon\otimes u^\varepsilon):\nabla\phi\,dxdt = -\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon} u_0^\varepsilon\cdot\phi(0,\cdot)\,dx, \tag{2.2}$$

for all divergence free test function $\phi \in C^\infty_c([0,\infty)\times\Omega^\varepsilon)$. This solution verifies

- the transport equation (1.9) in the sense of distribution;

[1] projection on divergence free vector fields which are tangent to the boundary.

- the inequality

$$\|\omega^\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq \|\omega_0^\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq \|\omega_0\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)}, \quad \forall p \in [1,\infty]; \tag{2.3}$$

- the conservation of the circulation around $\mathcal{K}_{i,j}^\varepsilon$ for all i,j (the Kelvin theorem).

Moreover, if the domain is smooth, this solution is unique and is a renormalized solution of (1.9) in the sense of DiPerna-Lions.

As $(u^\varepsilon,\omega^\varepsilon)$ is defined on an ε-dependent domain, we extend these functions by zero in the holes. All the convergence results in this paper concern the extended functions.

Now, let us derive an estimate of u^ε in $L^\infty_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2_{\rm loc}(\overline{\Omega}))$ uniformly in ε. The function

$$\widetilde{u}^\varepsilon := u^\varepsilon - \frac{\int \omega_0^\varepsilon}{2\pi}\nabla^\perp(\chi \ln|x|)$$

is divergence free, tangent to the boundary and verifies in a weak sense

$$\partial_t \widetilde{u}^\varepsilon + u^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla\widetilde{u}^\varepsilon = -\nabla p^\varepsilon - \Big(\widetilde{u}^\varepsilon + \frac{\int \omega_0^\varepsilon}{2\pi}\nabla^\perp(\chi\ln|x|)\Big)\cdot\nabla\Big(\frac{\int\omega_0^\varepsilon}{2\pi}\nabla^\perp(\chi\ln|x|)\Big), \quad \widetilde{u}^\varepsilon(0,\cdot)=\widetilde{u}_0^\varepsilon\in L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon).$$

Multiplying by $\widetilde{u}^\varepsilon$ and integrating (or considering a test function $\phi = \mathbb{1}_{[0,t]}\widetilde{u}^\varepsilon$, which is possible by density), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\widetilde{u}^\varepsilon(t,\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} &\leq \|\widetilde{u}_0^\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + C\int_0^t \Big(\|\widetilde{u}^\varepsilon(s,\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + \|\widetilde{u}^\varepsilon(s,\cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}\Big)\,ds\\ &\leq \|\widetilde{u}_0^\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + C\int_0^t \Big(\|\widetilde{u}^\varepsilon(s,\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + 1\Big)\,ds\end{aligned}$$

and we deduce by Gronwall inequality:

$$\|\widetilde{u}^\varepsilon(t,\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq (\|\widetilde{u}_0^\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}+1)e^{Ct}.$$

Putting together with the uniform estimate of $\widetilde{u}_0^\varepsilon$ (2.1), we get that $\widetilde{u}^\varepsilon$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2(\Omega))$, hence

$$u^\varepsilon \text{ is uniformly bounded in } L^\infty_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2_{\rm loc}(\overline{\Omega})). \tag{2.4}$$

Remark 2.1. *The assumption concerning the zero circulation of u_0^ε is crucial to obtain a uniform L^2 estimate. For non-zero circulations γ_i, the authors in* [21] *have had to develop an L^p theory for $p<2$: when an inclusion shrinks to a point $x_{i,j}$, a reminiscent term appears of the form $\gamma_i\frac{(x-x_{i,j})^\perp}{|x-x_{i,j}|^2}$, which belongs to $L^p_{\rm loc}$ only for $p<2$ (see also* [16]*). However, the continuity of the Leray projector in L^p ($p<2$) uniformly in ε is unclear (see Section 5 for further discussions).*

Remark 2.2. *As the domain is regular (namely the boundary is $C^{1,\beta}$), elliptic estimates imply that u^ε is continuous up to the boundary, which gives a meaning (in a strong sense) to the circulation and tangency conditions.*

2.2. **Convergence for large distance.** The analysis in [5] is based on the remark that u^ε satisfies at each time

$$\begin{gathered}\operatorname{div} u^\varepsilon = 0 \text{ in } \Omega^\varepsilon, \quad \operatorname{curl} u^\varepsilon = \omega^\varepsilon \text{ in } \Omega^\varepsilon, \quad u^\varepsilon\cdot n = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega^\varepsilon\\ \lim_{|x|\to\infty} u^\varepsilon(t,x) = 0, \quad \oint_{\partial\mathcal{K}_{i,j}^\varepsilon} u^\varepsilon\cdot\tau\,ds = 0 \text{ for all } i,j,\end{gathered}$$

whereas $K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon]$ verifies

$$\begin{gathered}\operatorname{div} K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon] = 0 \text{ in } \Omega^\varepsilon, \quad \operatorname{curl} K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon] = \omega^\varepsilon \text{ in } \Omega^\varepsilon,\\ \lim_{|x|\to\infty} K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon](t,x) = 0, \quad \oint_{\partial\mathcal{K}_{i,j}^\varepsilon} K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon]\cdot\tau\,ds = 0 \text{ for all } i,j.\end{gathered}$$

The main idea is to introduce, for any function $f \in L^\infty_c(\overline{\Omega^\varepsilon})$, an explicit approximate solution $v^\varepsilon[f]$ such that

$$\operatorname{div} v^\varepsilon[f] = 0 \text{ in } \Omega^\varepsilon, \quad v^\varepsilon[f]\cdot n = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega^\varepsilon, \quad \lim_{|x|\to\infty} v^\varepsilon[f](t,x) = 0 \tag{2.5}$$

which is close to $K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[f]$ in L^2. More precisely, the core of the permeability result in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 is contained in the following key proposition:

Proposition 2.3. (Permeability) *Assume that $\mathcal{K}$ verifies* (H1).

- *Consider Ω_2^ε* (1.3) *in the case $d_\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon$. For any $f \in L^\infty_c(\overline{\Omega_2^\varepsilon})$ there exists $v^\varepsilon[f]$ satisfying* (2.5) *such that*
$$\|K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[f] - v^\varepsilon[f]\|_{L^2(\Omega_2^\varepsilon)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty}\frac{\varepsilon}{d_\varepsilon},$$
with C independent of f and ε.
- *Consider Ω_1^ε* (1.4) *with $\mathcal{K}$ verifying also* (H2). *For any $f \in L^\infty_c(\overline{\Omega_1^\varepsilon})$ there exists $v^\varepsilon[f]$ satisfying* (2.5) *such that*
$$\|K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[f] - v^\varepsilon[f]\|_{L^2(\Omega_1^\varepsilon)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty}\sqrt{\varepsilon}\Big(1+\Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{d_\varepsilon}\Big)^{\frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma+1)}}\Big),$$
with C independent of f and ε.

This proposition is proved in Section 3. The main idea is to estimate the correction of the tangency condition in the exterior of one simply connected compact set.

As in [5], let us show that this proposition implies the point (i) of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

Step 1: uniform L^2 estimate for $u^\varepsilon - K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon]$.

For each time, we remark that $u^\varepsilon - v^\varepsilon[\omega^\varepsilon]$ and $K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon] - v^\varepsilon[\omega^\varepsilon]$ are divergence free, tend to zero when $|x|\to\infty$, have the same curl and circulations around $\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon_{i,j}$ for all i,j. The only difference is that $u^\varepsilon - v^\varepsilon[\omega^\varepsilon]$ is tangent to the boundary of Ω^ε, which implies that it is the Leray projection of $K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon] - v^\varepsilon[\omega^\varepsilon]$. Therefore, by orthogonality of this projection in L^2 together with triangle inequality, we have

$$\|u^\varepsilon - K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon]\|_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq \|u^\varepsilon - v^\varepsilon[\omega^\varepsilon]\|_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + \|v^\varepsilon[\omega^\varepsilon] - K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon]\|_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \leq 2\|v^\varepsilon[\omega^\varepsilon] - K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon]\|_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}.$$

Under the assumptions of the point (i) of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, the estimate of $\|\omega^\varepsilon\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty}$ (2.3) and Proposition 2.3 give that

$$\|u^\varepsilon - K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon]\|_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \to 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon\to 0 \quad \text{uniformly on time.}$$

Recalling the standard estimate for the Biot-Savart kernel:

$$\|K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[f]\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \Big\|\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|}\,dy\Big\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C\|f\|^{1/2}_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)}\|f\|^{1/2}_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)}, \tag{2.6}$$

and the fact that $\|\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^2\setminus\Omega^\varepsilon}\|_{L^2}\to 0$ (because $d_\varepsilon/\varepsilon\to\infty$ in the case of inclusions distributed on the square), we infer that

$$u^\varepsilon - K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon] \to 0 \quad \text{strongly in } L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)), \tag{2.7}$$

where we have extended u^ε by zero inside the holes.

Step 2: compactness for the vorticity.

Thanks to the uniform estimate of $\|\omega^\varepsilon\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty}$ (2.3), Banach-Alaoglu's theorem infers that we can extract a subsequence such that

$$\omega^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \omega \quad \text{weak-}* \text{ in } L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^1\cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)),$$

which establishes the vorticity convergence stating in point (i) of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

Next, we derive a temporal estimate. For any $\varepsilon>0$, as u^ε is regular enough and tangent to the boundary, we can write the equation verified by ω^ε for any test function $\phi\in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$:

$$(\partial_t\omega^\varepsilon,\phi)_{H^{-1},H^1} = \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon} u^\varepsilon\omega^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla\phi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2}(u^\varepsilon - K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon])\omega^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla\phi + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon]\omega^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla\phi,$$

which is bounded by $C\|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2}$ thanks to (2.3), (2.6) and (2.7). Hence, we have

$$\|\partial_t\omega^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2))}\leq C.$$

By Lemma C.1 in [23], this property can be used to extract a subsequence such that

$$\omega^\varepsilon\to\omega \text{ in } C([0,T];L^{3/2}\cap L^4(\mathbb{R}^2)-w) \text{ for all } T. \tag{2.8}$$

Step 3: compactness for the velocity.

Now, we define $u:=K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega]$ and we use the previous steps to pass to the limit in the decomposition

$$u^\varepsilon-u=(u^\varepsilon-K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon])+K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon-\omega]. \tag{2.9}$$

Thanks to (2.7), it is obvious that the first term on the right-hand side of (2.9) converges to zero in $L^2_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^+\times\mathbb{R}^2)$. Concerning the second term: for x fixed, the map $y\mapsto\frac{(x-y)^\perp}{|x-y|^2}$ belongs to $L^{4/3}(B(x,1))\cap L^3(B(x,1)^c)$, then (2.8) implies that for all t,x, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\frac{(x-y)^\perp}{|x-y|^2}(\omega^\varepsilon-\omega)(t,y)\,dy\to 0\quad\text{ as }\varepsilon\to 0.$$

So, this integral converges pointwise to zero, and it is uniformly bounded by (2.6) and (2.3) with respect of x and t. Applying the dominated convergence theorem, we obtain the convergence of $K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon-\omega]$ in $L^2_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^+\times\mathbb{R}^2)$. This ends the proof of the velocity convergence stated in point (i) of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

Step 4: passing to the limit in the Euler equations.

Finally, we verify that (u,ω) is the unique solution of the Euler equations in $\mathbb{R}^2$.

The divergence and curl conditions are verified by the expression: $u=K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega]$. Next, we use that u^ε and ω^ε satisfies (1.9) in the sense of distribution in Ω^ε, that u^ε is regular and tangent to the boundary, to infer that for any test function $\phi\in C_c^\infty([0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^2)$, we have

$$\int_0^\infty\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\phi_t\omega^\varepsilon\,dxdt+\int_0^\infty\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\nabla\phi\cdot u^\varepsilon\omega^\varepsilon\,dxdt=-\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\phi(0,x)\omega_0(x)\mathbb{1}_{\Omega^\varepsilon}dx,$$

where we have extended ω^ε by zero and use that $\omega^\varepsilon(0,\cdot)=\omega_0|_{\Omega^\varepsilon}$. By passing to the limit as $\varepsilon\to 0$, thanks to the strong-weak convergence of the pair $(u^\varepsilon,\omega^\varepsilon)$, we conclude that (u,ω) verifies the vorticity equation. In the whole plane, this is equivalent to state that u verifies the velocity equation. As this solution is unique (Yudovich theorem), we deduce that the convergences hold without extracting a subsequence. This ends the proof of point (i) of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

2.3. **Convergence for small distance.** The proof of impermeability of the porous medium is totally different from the proof that the limit satisfies the non-linear equation in the vicinity of the inclusions.

The easiest way to compute the limit of the tangency condition is to write the weak formulation. The weak form of

$$\operatorname{div}u_0=0\text{ in }\Omega\quad\text{and}\quad u_0\cdot n=0\text{ on }\partial\Omega$$

reads

$$\int_\Omega u_0\cdot h=0\text{ for all }h\in G(\Omega):=\{w\in L^2(\Omega)\ :\ w=\nabla p,\ \text{for some } p\in H^1_{\rm loc}(\Omega)\text{ and } w(x)=0\text{ for large } x\}.$$

This general definition was introduced by Galdi [13] and used by Gérard-Varet and Lacave [15]. In this article we consider smooth test functions:

$$h\in\{\nabla p\ :\ p\in C_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega})\}$$

where

$$C_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega}):=\{\phi\text{ such that }D^k\phi\text{ is bounded and uniformly continuous in }\Omega,\ \forall k\in\mathbb{N}\ \text{and }\phi(x)=0\text{ for large }x\}.$$

We refer to Galdi for discussions about the density of $\{\nabla p\ :\ p\in C_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega})\}$ in $G(\Omega)$ for the L^2 norm (see e.g. in [13] the end of Section III.2 and Theorem II.7.2).

Remark 2.4. *Let us develop here an example, in order to focus on the importance of choosing test functions which can have a jump across the segment. We consider $p \in C_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega_1})$ such that $p \equiv 0$ in a neighborhood of the endpoints and below the segment. Namely, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $p(x) = 0$ for all $x \in B(0,\delta) \cup B((1,0),\delta) \cup ([0,1] \times [-\delta, 0))$. Hence, assuming that u_0 is continuous up to the curve (with different values on each side), we have*

$$\int_{\Omega_1} u_0 \cdot \nabla p = \int_\delta^{1-\delta} p u_0^{up} \cdot (-e_2).$$

In this case, of course ∇p belongs to $\{\nabla p \ : \ p \in C_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega})\}$, and we note that the tangency condition implies that the upper value of u_0 is tangent to the unit segment. It is important to note that if we only consider smooth test functions in $\mathbb{R}^2$, we would only prove that $u_0^{up} \cdot e_2 = u_0^{down} \cdot e_2$, which is weaker than the impermeability condition.

We should not confuse the notation $C_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ with the set of smooth functions compactly supported in the closure of Ω. In particular, $C_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega_1}) \subsetneq C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, since functions in $C_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega_1})$ are allowed to have a discontinuity though the segment.

Therefore, we will prove the tangency condition in this sense:

$$\int_\Omega u_0 \cdot \nabla p = 0 \text{ for all } p \in C_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega}). \tag{2.10}$$

Similarly, the tangency condition on u will read

$$\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega u \cdot \nabla p = 0 \text{ for all } p \in C_c^\infty((0,\infty); C_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega})). \tag{2.11}$$

The non-penetration of the porous medium for small distance will follow from the following key proposition.

Proposition 2.5. (Non-penetration) *Assume that $\mathcal{K}$ verifies* (H1) *and let $(v^\varepsilon)_\varepsilon$ a bounded sequence in $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, of divergence free vector fields which are tangent to the boundary $\partial\Omega^\varepsilon$.*

- *Consider Ω_1^ε* (1.4) *with $\mathcal{K}$ verifying also* (H2) *and $\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{2+\frac{1}{\gamma}}} \to 0$. For any $p \in C_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega_1})$, we have*

$$\int_{\Omega_1} v^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla p \, dx \to 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

- *Consider Ω_2^ε* (1.3) *(where $(\pm 1, 0), (0, \pm 1) \in \partial\mathcal{K}$) and $\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. For any $p \in C_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega_2})$, we have*

$$\int_{\Omega_2} v^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla p \, dx \to 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

Unfortunately, we won't obtain an explicit rate in this proposition. The proof of this proposition will be performed in Section 4. In the rest of this section, we prove that this proposition implies the point (ii) of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

Step 1: weak convergence.

By the estimates (2.1), (2.3), (2.4) and by Banach-Alaoglu's theorem, we can extract a subsequence $\varepsilon \to 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \omega^\varepsilon &\rightharpoonup \omega \quad \text{weak-}* \text{ in } L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; L^1 \cap L^\infty(\Omega)); \\ u_0^\varepsilon &\rightharpoonup u_0 \quad \text{weakly in } L^2_{\text{loc}}(\Omega); \\ u^\varepsilon &\rightharpoonup u \quad \text{weak-}* \text{ in } L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it is obvious that:

$$\omega_0^\varepsilon = \omega_0|_{\Omega^\varepsilon} \to \omega_0 \text{ strongly in } L^q(\Omega), \quad \forall q \in [1, \infty).$$

In all these statements, we have extended the functions by zero inside the inclusions. Passing to the limit in the sense of distribution, it is straightforward that

$$\operatorname{div} u = \operatorname{div} u_0 = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \operatorname{curl} u = \omega \text{ and } \operatorname{curl} u_0 = \omega_0 \text{ in } \Omega.$$

The weak limit is also sufficient to prove that ω verifies (2.3).

Step 2: tangency condition.

In both cases, we deduce directly from (2.1) and Proposition 2.5 that for any $p \in C_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ we have

$$\int_\Omega u_0^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla p \to 0.$$

As u_0^ε converges weakly to u_0, we conclude that u_0 is tangent (in the weak sense (2.10)).

Concerning u, for $p \in C_c^\infty((0,\infty)\times\overline{\Omega})$ we set $T, R > 0$ such that $\operatorname{supp} p \subset (0,T)\times B(0,R)$. For a.e. $t \in [0,T]$, (2.4) and Proposition 2.5 imply that

$$F(t) := \int_\Omega u^\varepsilon(t,\cdot)\cdot\nabla p(t,\cdot) \to 0.$$

Moreover, F is uniformly bounded by $\|u^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(B(0,R)))}\|p\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;W^{1,\infty})} \le C$ so the dominated convergence theorem together with the weak convergence of u^ε to u give the tangency property for u (in the weak sense (2.11)).

Remark 2.6. *Let us justify that the tangency is verified in a strong sense on the boundary, except on the corners. By uniqueness of vectors fields verifying the tangency in the weak sense,* $\operatorname{div} u_0 = 0$ *and* $\operatorname{curl} u_0 = \omega_0 \in L^\infty$ *(see* [15, Section 4.2]*), the standard elliptic estimates in domains with corners (the exterior of the segment can be seen as a domain with two corners of angles* 2π*) imply that* u_0 *is continuous up to the boundary, except near the corners where it blows up (see e.g.* [6, 18] *and more recently* [20]*). Near the corners of the square, the velocity behaves like* $1/|x|^{1/3}$*. In the exterior of the segment, the velocity is also continuous up to the segment, with different values on each side of the segment, and blows up near the end-points like the inverse of the square root of the distance.*

This argument also holds for $u(t,\cdot)$ *for a.e.* t*.*

Step 3: circulation condition.

First, we justify that the circulation is well defined in the strong sense. As in Remark 2.6, the standard elliptic estimates in domains with corners give the explicit behavior of u_0 and confirms the integrability of the trace. In the exterior of the segment, the quantity $\oint_{\partial\Omega_1} u_0\cdot\tau\,ds$ should be understood as the integral on the upper value $\int_0^1 u_0^{up}\cdot(-e_1)$ plus the lower value $\int_0^1 u_0^{down}\cdot e_1$.

The easiest way to compute the limit of the circulation is to write the weak formulation. Namely, let us consider a smooth cutoff function χ such that $\chi \equiv 1$ in $B(0,R)$ and $\chi \equiv 0$ in $B(0,R+1)^c$, with R large enough such that $\partial\Omega^\varepsilon \subset B(0,R)$. Then, thanks to the regularity explained just above, we have:

$$\oint_{\partial\Omega} u_0\cdot\tau\,ds = -\int_\Omega \omega_0\chi\,dx - \int_\Omega u_0\cdot\nabla^\perp\chi\,dx.$$

Moreover, we have by the Stokes formula and the zero circulation assumption

$$-\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon}\omega_0^\varepsilon\chi\,dx - \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon} u_0^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla^\perp\chi\,dx = \sum_{i,j}\oint_{\partial\mathcal{K}_{i,j}^\varepsilon} u_0^\varepsilon\cdot\tau\,ds = 0.$$

Passing to the limit $\varepsilon\to 0$ in the previous equation gives that the circulation of u_0 around the unit segment is equal to zero. The proof for u is exactly the same, adding a test function $\phi\in\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ in time:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}+}\phi(t)\oint_{\partial\Omega} u(t,\cdot)\cdot\tau\,ds\,dt = 0.$$

Step 4: passing to the limit in the non-linear equations.

Of course, the weak convergences are not sufficient to pass to the limit in the non-linear term: $\int(u^\varepsilon\otimes u^\varepsilon):\nabla\phi$ for (1.5) and $\int\omega^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla\psi$ for (1.9). We need some local strong convergence, far away from the porous medium. The following argument was introduced by Lions and Masmoudi [24] and used also in [14].

Let us fix $T>0$ and $\mathcal{O}\Subset\Omega$ be a smooth open subset of Ω. We write the Helmholtz-Weyl decomposition:

$$u^\varepsilon = \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}}u^\varepsilon + \nabla q^\varepsilon$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u^\varepsilon$ is the Leray projection, i.e. a divergence free vector field which is tangent to the boundary $\partial\mathcal{O}$. Then, it is obvious that $\operatorname{curl} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u^\varepsilon = \operatorname{curl} u^\varepsilon = \omega^\varepsilon$ and $\Delta q^\varepsilon = 0$. Moreover, by the orthogonality in L^2, we have:

$$\|\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\mathcal{O}))} + \|\nabla q^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\mathcal{O}))} \leq 2\|u^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\mathcal{O}))} \leq C$$

where we have used (2.4). As $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u^\varepsilon$ is divergence free, bounded in $L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\mathcal{O}))$ and its curl belongs uniformly to $L^\infty(0,T\times\mathcal{O})$, it follows by standard elliptic estimates on smooth domains (e.g. Calderón-Zygmund inequality) that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u^\varepsilon$ belongs uniformly to $L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\mathcal{O}))$. This argument can be also applied to state that u^ε is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\mathcal{O}))$.

To derive a time estimate, let us denote

$$\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{O}) = \text{ the closure in } H^1 \text{ of } \{\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathcal{O}),\ \operatorname{div}\phi = 0\},$$
$$\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{O})' \text{ the dual of } \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{O})$$
$$\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{O}) = \text{ the closure in } L^2 \text{ of } \{\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathcal{O}),\ \operatorname{div}\phi = 0\}.$$

Hence we have that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u^\varepsilon$ belongs uniformly to $L^\infty(0,T;\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{O}))$. For any divergence free test function $\phi \in C_c^\infty((0,T)\times\mathcal{O})$, we compute thanks to (1.5):

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \partial_t \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u^\varepsilon, \phi\rangle &= \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u^\varepsilon \partial_t \phi \, dxdt = \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}} u^\varepsilon \partial_t \phi \, dxdt = -\int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}} (u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon) : \nabla\phi \, dxdt \\ \left|\langle \partial_t \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u^\varepsilon, \phi\rangle\right| &\leq \|u^\varepsilon\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^4(\mathcal{O}))} \|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\mathcal{O}))}\sqrt{T} \leq C\|\phi\|_{L^2(0,T;\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{O}))}. \end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality, C depends only on $\omega_0, \mathcal{O}, T$. By the Aubin-Lions lemma in $H^1(\mathcal{O}) \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{O}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{O}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{V}'(\mathcal{O})$ we conclude that there exists a subsequence such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u^\varepsilon \to v \text{ strongly in } L^\infty(0,T;\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{O})).$$

For this subsequence, we have that $\nabla q^\varepsilon = u^\varepsilon - \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u^\varepsilon$ converges weakly in L^2 to a gradient ∇q (the set of gradient function is a closed subspace), hence at the limit we have $u = v + \nabla q$ and then $v = \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u$. By the unicity of the limit, we conclude that we do not need to extract a subsequence in the Aubin-Lions lemma:

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u^\varepsilon \to \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u \text{ strongly in } L^\infty(0,T;\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{O})), \text{ for the sequence } \varepsilon \to 0 \text{ introduced in Step 1.}$$

We are now in position to pass to the limit in the non linear equations.

For any divergence free test function $\phi \in C_c^\infty([0,\infty)\times\Omega)$, there exist $T > 0$ and $\mathcal{O} \Subset \Omega$ be a smooth open subset of Ω, such that $\operatorname{supp}\phi \subset [0,T)\times\mathcal{O}$. For ε small enough such that $\mathcal{O} \Subset \Omega^\varepsilon$, the weak formulation of (1.5) and (1.8) reads:

$$\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega u^\varepsilon \cdot \partial_t \phi \, dxdt + \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega (u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon) : \nabla\phi \, dxdt = -\int_\Omega u_0^\varepsilon \cdot \phi(0,\cdot)\, dx.$$

The weak limits of Step 1 are sufficient to pass to the limit in the first and third integrals. Before considering the second integral, let us note that for any harmonic function f (i.e. $\Delta f = 0$), we have the following relation:

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}} \nabla f \otimes \nabla f : \nabla\phi = -\int_{\mathcal{O}} \operatorname{div}(\nabla f \otimes \nabla f)\phi = -\int_{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{1}{2}\nabla|\nabla f|^2 \cdot \phi + \Delta f \nabla f \cdot \phi\right) = 0, \tag{2.12}$$

because ϕ is divergence free and compactly supported in $\mathcal{O}$. Such a relation can be applied with $f = q^\varepsilon$ and $f = q$. Therefore, the second integral of (2.2) can be decomposed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega (u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon) : \nabla\phi \, dxdt &= \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}} (\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon) : \nabla\phi \, dxdt + \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}} (\nabla q^\varepsilon \otimes \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u^\varepsilon) : \nabla\phi \, dxdt \\ &\quad + \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}} (\nabla q^\varepsilon \otimes \nabla q^\varepsilon) : \nabla\phi \, dxdt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}} (\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon) : \nabla\phi \, dxdt + \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}} (\nabla q^\varepsilon \otimes \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u^\varepsilon) : \nabla\phi \, dxdt \end{aligned}$$

thanks to (2.12). By the weak limits of u^ε and ∇q^ε, the strong limit of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u^\varepsilon$ and (2.12), we easily verify that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega (u^\varepsilon \otimes u^\varepsilon) : \nabla \phi \, dxdt &\to \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}} (\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u \otimes u) : \nabla \phi \, dxdt + \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}} (\nabla q \otimes \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u) : \nabla \phi \, dxdt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}} (\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u \otimes u) : \nabla \phi \, dxdt + \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}} (\nabla q \otimes \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}} u) : \nabla \phi \, dxdt \\ &\quad + \int_0^T \int_{\mathcal{O}} (\nabla q \otimes \nabla q) : \nabla \phi \, dxdt \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega (u \otimes u) : \nabla \phi \, dxdt.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have proved that u verifies the weak formulation of (1.5) and (1.8):

$$\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega u \cdot \partial_t \phi \, dxdt + \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega (u \otimes u) : \nabla \phi \, dxdt = - \int_\Omega u_0 \cdot \phi(0, \cdot) \, dx.$$

The vorticity formulation is an obvious consequence of the velocity formulation: indeed, for any $\psi \in C_c^\infty([0, \infty) \times \Omega)$ we note that $\phi := \nabla^\perp \psi$ is a divergence free test function for which the previous equation holds true. Thanks to elliptic regularity on a smooth subdomain $\mathcal{O}$ including the support of ϕ, we have that u belongs to $H^1(\mathcal{O})$ and then to $L^4(\mathcal{O})$. Hence, we can integrate by parts to get (1.9):

$$\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega \omega \partial_t \psi \, dxdt + \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega \omega u \cdot \nabla \psi \, dxdt = - \int_\Omega \omega_0 \psi(0, \cdot) \, dx.$$

This ends the proof of point (ii) of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

3. Permeability for large distance

The goal of this section is to prove Proposition 2.3. This section improves and simplifies the results of [5]. The general argument is similar to [5], but we make more precise choices of cutoff functions. We refer to that article for more details (in particular for the Biot-Savart law in exterior domains). Let $f \in L_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega^\varepsilon})$ be fixed.

3.1. Construction of the correction.

The main idea is to use the explicit formula of the Green function (with Dirichlet boundary condition) in the exterior of one simply connected compact set $\mathcal{K}$:

$$G_{\mathcal{K}}(x, y) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \ln \frac{|\mathcal{T}(x) - \mathcal{T}(y)|}{|\mathcal{T}(x) - \mathcal{T}(y)^* || \mathcal{T}(y)|},$$

where $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{K}^c \to \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{B(0,1)}$ is a biholomorphism such that

$$\mathcal{T}(z) = \beta z + h(z) \tag{3.1}$$

for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and h a bounded holomorphic function. Above, we have denoted by

$$y^* = \frac{y}{|y|^2}$$

the conjugate point to y across the unit circle in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Hence, it is verified in [16, Section 3.1] that the following vector field

$$\nabla^\perp \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{K}} G_{\mathcal{K}}(x, y) f(y) \, dy + \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{K}} f}{2\pi} \nabla^\perp \ln |\mathcal{T}(x)|$$

is divergence free, tangent to the boundary, goes to zero as $|x| \to \infty$, its curl is equal to f and the circulation around $\mathcal{K}$ is equal to zero.

Now we introduce a cutoff function $\varphi_{i,j}^\varepsilon$ equal to 1 close to $\mathcal{K}_{i,j}^\varepsilon$:

$$\varphi_{i,j}^\varepsilon(x) := \varphi^\varepsilon(x - z_{i,j}^\varepsilon) \tag{3.2}$$

with $\varphi^\varepsilon \in C^1$ such that $\varphi^\varepsilon \equiv 1$ on $\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \partial \mathcal{K}$ and

- $\varphi^\varepsilon \equiv 0$ on $\partial([-\frac{\varepsilon + d_\varepsilon}{2}, \frac{\varepsilon + d_\varepsilon}{2}]^2)$ if the inclusions are distributed in both directions;

- $\varphi^\varepsilon \equiv 0$ on $\partial([-\frac{\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon}{2}, \frac{\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon}{2}] \times [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon])$ if the inclusions are distributed only on the segment.

Then, the correction is defined by

$$v^\varepsilon[f] := \nabla^\perp \psi^\varepsilon,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\psi^\varepsilon(x) :=& \frac{1}{2\pi}\Big(1 - \sum_{i,j} \varphi^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x)\Big) \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon} \ln|x-y| f(y)\,dy \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{i,j} \varphi^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x) \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon} \ln \frac{\varepsilon |\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x) - \mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y)||\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x)|}{2\beta |\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x) - \mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y)^*|} f(y)\,dy,\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x) := \mathcal{T}\left(\frac{x - z^\varepsilon_{i,j}}{\varepsilon/2}\right) \ : \ (\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon_{i,j})^c \to \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \overline{B(0,1)}.$$

In the neighborhood of $\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon_{i,j}$, this correction corresponds to the Biot-Savart law in the exterior of one obstacle, whereas, far away the porous medium, it is equal to the Biot Savart law in the whole plane $\mathbb{R}^2$. More precisely, we can check that $v^\varepsilon[f]$ verifies the following properties:

$$\operatorname{div} v^\varepsilon[f] = 0 \text{ in } \Omega^\varepsilon, \quad v^\varepsilon[f] \cdot n = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega^\varepsilon, \quad \lim_{x\to\infty} |v^\varepsilon[f](x)| = 0.$$

We decompose $K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[f] - v^\varepsilon[f]$ as

$$K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[f] - v^\varepsilon[f] = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{i,j} \nabla^\perp \varphi^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x)(w^{1,\varepsilon}_{i,j} + w^{2,\varepsilon}_{i,j}) + \varphi^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x)(w^{3,\varepsilon}_{i,j} + w^{4,\varepsilon}_{i,j}), \tag{3.3}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
w^{1,\varepsilon}_{i,j}(x) &= \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon} \ln \frac{2\beta|x-y|}{\varepsilon|\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x) - \mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y)|} f(y)\,dy, \\
w^{2,\varepsilon}_{i,j}(x) &= \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon} \ln \frac{|\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x) - \mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y)^*|}{|\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x)|} f(y)\,dy, \\
w^{3,\varepsilon}_{i,j}(x) &= \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon} \left(\frac{(x-y)^\perp}{|x-y|^2} - (D\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j})^T(x) \frac{(\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x) - \mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y))^\perp}{|\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x) - \mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y)|^2} \right) f(y)\,dy, \\
w^{4,\varepsilon}_{i,j}(x) &= (D\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j})^T(x) \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon} \left(\frac{\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x) - \mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y)^*}{|\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x) - \mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y)^*|^2} - \frac{\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x)}{|\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x)|^2} \right)^\perp f(y)\,dy.
\end{aligned}$$

In the following subsection, we estimate $w^{k,\varepsilon}_{i,j}$ on the support of $\varphi^\varepsilon_{i,j}$, and next, we will look for the best cutoff function φ^ε.

3.2. **Cell problem estimates.** When $\mathcal{K} = \overline{B(0,1)}$, $\mathcal{T} = \mathrm{Id}$ (so $\beta = 1$) and $w^\varepsilon_1 = w^\varepsilon_3 \equiv 0$. In this case, we also have $\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x) - \mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y)^* = \frac{2}{\varepsilon}\Big(x - z^\varepsilon_{i,j} - \varepsilon^2 \frac{y - z^\varepsilon_{i,j}}{4|y - z^\varepsilon_{i,j}|^2}\Big)$. Except in an ε-neighborhood of the inclusion, we note that $\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y)^*$ is small compare to $\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x)$. Hence, we can guess that w^ε_2 and w^ε_4 are small. This remark is the main motivation of this decomposition, and in the following estimates, we split the integrals in two parts: a small area in the vicinity of the inclusion and the far away region where $\mathcal{T}$ behaves as β Id. These estimates were made in [5], but we include here the main arguments for the sake of completeness. Moreover, we slightly improve the estimate of $w^{1,\varepsilon}_{i,j}$.

Let us before recall some basic estimates on conformal mapping. From the definition of $\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}$, it is possible to get the following Lipschitz estimates (see Lemma 2.1 in [5]):

$$\|\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}\|_{\mathrm{Lip}} \le \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad \|(\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j})^{-1}\|_{\mathrm{Lip}} \le C\varepsilon. \tag{3.4}$$

Moreover, as $\mathcal{T}$ behaves at infinity as β Id, it is also natural (Lemma 2.2 in [5]) that for all $r > 0$

$$\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}\Big(\partial B(z^\varepsilon_{i,j}, r) \cap (\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon_{i,j})^c\Big) \subset B\Big(0, C_1\frac{r}{\varepsilon}\Big) \setminus B\Big(0, C_2\frac{r}{\varepsilon}\Big) \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$(\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j})^{-1}\Big(\partial B(0,r+1)\Big) \subset B\Big(z^\varepsilon_{i,j}, \varepsilon C_3(r+1)\Big) \setminus B\Big(z^\varepsilon_{i,j}, \varepsilon C_4(r+1)\Big). \tag{3.6}$$

for some C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 positive numbers independent of i, j, ε.

Estimate of $w^{1,\varepsilon}_{i,j}$.

For $x \in \operatorname{supp} \varphi^\varepsilon_{i,j}$ fixed, we decompose the integral in two parts:

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^\varepsilon_C &:= \{y \in \Omega^\varepsilon,\ |\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x) - \mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y)| \le \varepsilon^{-1/4}\}, \\ \Omega^\varepsilon_F &:= \{y \in \Omega^\varepsilon,\ |\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x) - \mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y)| > \varepsilon^{-1/4}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

In the subdomain close to the inclusion Ω^ε_C, we set $z = \varepsilon\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x)$ and we change variables $\eta = \varepsilon\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_C} \Big|\ln(\varepsilon|\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x) - \mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y)|)f(y)\Big|\,dy &\le \int_{B(z,\varepsilon^{3/4})} \Big|\ln|z-\eta| f((\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j})^{-1}(\tfrac{\eta}{\varepsilon}))\Big| \frac{\big|\det D(\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j})^{-1}\big|(\frac{\eta}{\varepsilon})}{\varepsilon^2}\,d\eta \\ &\le \int_{B(z,\varepsilon^{3/4})} \Big|\ln|z-\eta| f((\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j})^{-1}(\tfrac{\eta}{\varepsilon}))\Big| \tfrac{1}{4}\big|\det D\mathcal{T}^{-1}\big|(\tfrac{\eta}{\varepsilon})d\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Using that $D\mathcal{T}^{-1}$ and f are bounded functions, we compute that:

$$\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_C} \Big|\ln(\varepsilon|\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x) - \mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y)|)f(y)\Big|\,dy \le C\|f\|_{L^\infty} \int_{B(0,\varepsilon^{3/4})} \Big|\ln|\xi|\Big|\,d\xi \le C\|f\|_{L^\infty}\varepsilon^{3/2}|\ln\varepsilon|.$$

To deal with $\ln(2\beta|x-y|)$, we remark that if $y \in \Omega^\varepsilon_C$, then (3.4) gives

$$|x-y| = |(\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j})^{-1}(\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x)) - (\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j})^{-1}(\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y))| \le \varepsilon C|\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x) - \mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y)| \le C\varepsilon^{3/4}.$$

So, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon_C} \Big|\ln(2\beta|x-y|)f(y)\Big|\,dy &\le \int_{B(x,C\varepsilon^{3/4})} \Big|\ln(2\beta|x-y|)f(y)\Big|\,dy \\ &\le \|f\|_{L^\infty} \int_{B(0,C\varepsilon^{3/4})} \Big|\ln|2\beta\xi|\Big|\,d\xi \le C\|f\|_{L^\infty}\varepsilon^{3/2}|\ln\varepsilon|. \end{aligned}$$

In the subdomain far away from the inclusion Ω^ε_F, we have by (3.4)

$$\varepsilon^{-1/4} \le |\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x) - \mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y)| \le \varepsilon^{-1}C|x-y|,$$

hence $|x-y| \ge \frac{\varepsilon^{3/4}}{C}$. Therefore, with h defined in (3.1), writing

$$\ln\frac{\varepsilon|\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x) - \mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y)|}{2\beta|x-y|} = \ln\frac{\Big|2\beta(x-y) + \varepsilon\Big(h\big(\frac{x-z^\varepsilon_{i,j}}{\varepsilon/2}\big) - h\big(\frac{y-z^\varepsilon_{i,j}}{\varepsilon/2}\big)\Big)\Big|}{2\beta|x-y|}, \tag{3.8}$$

we have

$$\frac{\varepsilon\Big|h\big(\frac{x-z^\varepsilon_{i,j}}{\varepsilon/2}\big) - h\big(\frac{y-z^\varepsilon_{i,j}}{\varepsilon/2}\big)\Big|}{2\beta|x-y|} \le \frac{\|h\|_{L^\infty}}{\beta}C\varepsilon^{1/4},$$

which is smaller that $1/2$ for ε small enough. We note easily that

$$\Big|\ln\tfrac{|b+c|}{|b|}\Big| \le 2\tfrac{|c|}{|b|}, \qquad \text{if } \tfrac{|c|}{|b|} \le \tfrac{1}{2}. \tag{3.9}$$

Applying this inequality with $c = h\big(\frac{x-z^\varepsilon_{i,j}}{\varepsilon/2}\big) - h\big(\frac{y-z^\varepsilon_{i,j}}{\varepsilon/2}\big)$ and $b = \frac{2\beta(x-y)}{\varepsilon}$, we compute from (3.8):

$$\left|\ln\frac{\varepsilon|\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x) - \mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}(y)|}{\beta|x-y|}\right| \ \le\ 2\frac{\varepsilon|h(\frac{x-z^\varepsilon_{i,j}}{\varepsilon/2}) - h(\frac{y-z^\varepsilon_{i,j}}{\varepsilon/2})|}{2\beta|x-y|} \le \frac{2\varepsilon\|h\|_{L^\infty}}{\beta|x-y|}.$$

Therefore, using (2.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Omega_F^\varepsilon}\Big|\ln\frac{\beta|x-y|}{\varepsilon|\mathcal{T}_{i,j}^\varepsilon(x)-\mathcal{T}_{i,j}^\varepsilon(y)|}f(y)\Big|\,dy &\le \int_{\Omega^\varepsilon}\frac{2\varepsilon\|h\|_{L^\infty}}{\beta|x-y|}|f(y)|\,dy\\ &\le C\varepsilon\|f\|_{L^\infty}^{1/2}\|f\|_{L^1}^{1/2}\end{aligned}$$

which allows us to conclude that

$$\|w_{i,j}^{1,\varepsilon}\|_{L^\infty(\text{supp }\varphi_{i,j}^\varepsilon)}\le C\varepsilon\|f\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty} \tag{3.10}$$

with C independent of i,j,ε and f.

Estimate of $w_{i,j}^{2,\varepsilon}$.

We set $z=\varepsilon\mathcal{T}_{i,j}^\varepsilon(x)$, and changing variables $\eta=\varepsilon\mathcal{T}_{i,j}^\varepsilon(y)$, we get

$$w_{i,j}^{2,\varepsilon}(x)=\int_{B(0,\varepsilon)^c}\ln\frac{|z-\varepsilon^2\eta^*|}{|z|}f(\tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\tfrac{\eta}{\varepsilon})+z_{i,j}^\varepsilon)\tfrac14|\det D\mathcal{T}^{-1}|(\tfrac{\eta}{\varepsilon})\,d\eta.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $0\in\overset{\circ}{\mathcal{K}}$, and we fix $\delta>0$ so that $B(0,\delta)\subset\mathcal{K}$. For $x\in\text{supp }\varphi_{i,j}^\varepsilon$, we easily note that

$$\delta\varepsilon\le|x-z_{i,j}^\varepsilon|\le\sqrt{2}\frac{\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon}{2},$$

then, we deduce by (3.5) that

$$C_2\delta\varepsilon\le|z|\le C_1\sqrt{2}\frac{\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon}{2}.$$

As for any η we have

$$\frac{|\varepsilon^2\eta^*|}{|z|}\le\frac{\varepsilon}{C_2\delta|\eta|},$$

we infer by (3.9) (with $b=z$ and $c=-\varepsilon^2\eta^*$) that

$$\left|\ln\frac{|z-\varepsilon^2\eta^*|}{|z|}\right|\le2\frac{\varepsilon^2|\eta^*|}{|z|}\le\frac{2\varepsilon}{C_2\delta|\eta|}\qquad\text{if}\quad\frac{\varepsilon}{C_2\delta|\eta|}\le\frac12.$$

Therefore, we define $R=2/(C_2\delta)$ and we split the integral in two parts: $B(0,R\varepsilon)^c$ and $B(0,R\varepsilon)\setminus B(0,\varepsilon)$.

In the first subdomain $B(0,R\varepsilon)^c$, we use the previous inequality to compute

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\int_{B(0,R\varepsilon)^c}\ln\frac{|z-\varepsilon^2\eta^*|}{|z|}f(\tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\tfrac{\eta}{\varepsilon})+z_{i,j}^\varepsilon)\tfrac14|\det D\mathcal{T}^{-1}|(\tfrac{\eta}{\varepsilon})\,d\eta\Big|\\ &\quad\le\frac{2\varepsilon}{C_2\delta}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\frac{|f(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\frac{\eta}{\varepsilon})+z_{i,j}^\varepsilon)|\frac14|\det D\mathcal{T}^{-1}|(\frac{\eta}{\varepsilon})}{|\eta|}\,d\eta\\ &\quad\le C\varepsilon\Big\|f(\tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\tfrac{\eta}{\varepsilon})+z_{i,j}^\varepsilon)\tfrac14\det D\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\tfrac{\eta}{\varepsilon})\Big\|_{L^\infty}^{1/2}\Big\|f(\tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\tfrac{\eta}{\varepsilon})+z_{i,j}^\varepsilon)\tfrac14\det D\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\tfrac{\eta}{\varepsilon})\Big\|_{L^1}^{1/2}\\ &\quad\le C\varepsilon\|f\|_{L^\infty}^{1/2}\|f\|_{L^1}^{1/2},\end{aligned}$$

where we have applied (2.6) for the function $\eta\mapsto|f(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\frac{\eta}{\varepsilon})+z_{i,j}^\varepsilon)|\frac14|\det D\mathcal{T}^{-1}|(\frac{\eta}{\varepsilon})$ at $x=0$, used that $D\mathcal{T}^{-1}$ is bounded and that $\|f(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\frac{\eta}{\varepsilon})+z_{i,j}^\varepsilon)\frac14\det D\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\frac{\eta}{\varepsilon})\|_{L^1}=\|f\|_{L^1}$ by changing variables back.

In the second subdomain $B(0,R\varepsilon)\setminus B(0,\varepsilon)$, we use the relation

$$\frac{|z-\varepsilon^2\eta^*|}{|z|}=\frac{|\eta-\varepsilon^2z^*|}{|\eta|}$$

which can be easily verified by squaring both side. As $D\mathcal{T}^{-1}$ is bounded and $\varepsilon^2 z^* \in B(0,\varepsilon)$, we compute

$$\Big|\int_{B(0,R\varepsilon)\setminus B(0,\varepsilon)} \ln\frac{|z-\varepsilon^2\eta^*|}{|z|} f(\tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\tfrac{\eta}{\varepsilon})+z^\varepsilon_{i,j})\tfrac{1}{4}|\det D\mathcal{T}^{-1}|(\tfrac{\eta}{\varepsilon})\,d\eta\Big| \le 2C\|f\|_{L^\infty}\int_{B(0,(R+1)\varepsilon)} |\ln|\eta||\,d\eta$$
$$\le C\|f\|_{L^\infty}\varepsilon^2|\ln\varepsilon|,$$

which allows us to conclude that

$$\|w^{2,\varepsilon}_{i,j}\|_{L^\infty(\operatorname{supp}\varphi^\varepsilon_{i,j})} \le C\varepsilon\|f\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty} \tag{3.11}$$

with C independent of i,j,ε and f.

Estimate of $w^{3,\varepsilon}_{i,j}$ and $w^{4,\varepsilon}_{i,j}$.

With similar technics, i.e. by changing variables and using the expression of $\mathcal{T}^\varepsilon_{i,j}$ in terms of $\mathcal{T}$, it is not difficult to prove that

$$\|w^{3,\varepsilon}_{i,j}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega^\varepsilon)} + \|w^{4,\varepsilon}_{i,j}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \le C\|f\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty}, \tag{3.12}$$

with C independent of i,j,ε and f (see e.g. [16, Theorem 4.1]). Actually, we were more precise in [5] proving an estimate which tends to zero, but as we will discuss in the next subsection, the restriction $\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\to\infty$ (for inclusions distributed on the square) comes from $w^{1,\varepsilon}_{i,j}$ and $w^{2,\varepsilon}_{i,j}$.

3.3. **Optimal cutoff function.** Putting together the form of $\varphi^\varepsilon_{i,j}$ (3.2), the decomposition (3.3) and the estimates (3.10), (3.11) and (3.12) we have obtained:

$$\|K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[f]-v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \le C\|f\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty}\Big(\varepsilon\|\nabla\varphi^\varepsilon\|_{L^2}+\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\Big)\sqrt{\sum_{i,j}1}, \tag{3.13}$$

so the question is to find the best φ^ε such that the right hand side term tends to zero.

Case 1: inclusions distributed on the square.

In the case (1.3), the number of inclusions is $N_\varepsilon^2 \le 2/d_\varepsilon^2$, so $\sqrt{\sum_{i,j}1}\le\sqrt{2}/d_\varepsilon$.

For $d_\varepsilon \ge \varepsilon$, it is sufficient to consider φ^ε independent of d_ε. Namely, let $\varphi^1\in C_c^\infty([-1,1]^2)$ such that $\varphi^1\equiv 1$ on $[-1/2,1/2]^2$, then we define

$$\varphi^\varepsilon(x) := \varphi^1\Big(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\Big).$$

It is easy to note that $\varphi^\varepsilon\equiv 1$ on $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\partial\mathcal{K}$ and $\varphi^\varepsilon\equiv 0$ on $\partial([-\frac{\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon}{2},\frac{\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon}{2}]^2)$. With this expression, it is also clear that there exists $C>0$ such that

$$\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_{L^2},\ \varepsilon\|\nabla\varphi^\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\le C\varepsilon.$$

In this case, (3.13) reads

$$\|K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[f]-v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \le C\|f\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty}\frac{\varepsilon}{d_\varepsilon}$$

which ends the proof of the first case of Proposition 2.3.

Case 2: Inclusions distributed on the segment.

We now have

$$\sqrt{\sum_{i,j}1} = \sqrt{N_\varepsilon} \le \min\Big(\sqrt{\frac{2}{\varepsilon}},\sqrt{\frac{2}{d_\varepsilon}}\Big). \tag{3.14}$$

In [5], we have considered a cutoff function such that $\operatorname{supp}\varphi^\varepsilon$ was included in $([-\frac{\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon}{2},\frac{\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon}{2}]^2)\setminus([-\frac{\varepsilon}{2},\frac{\varepsilon}{2}]^2)$, which allowed us to get a zero limit for $d_\varepsilon/\varepsilon^2\to\infty$. This rate is optimal if $\mathcal{K}$ is a square, but for the other shape, we can improve the cutoff function by using γ (see (H2)).

The assumption (H2) implies that the minimal distance between $\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon_{i,1}$ and $\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon_{i+1,1}$ is reached for a unique point of $\partial\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon_{i,1}$: $z^\varepsilon_{i,1}+(\frac{\varepsilon}{2},0)$. Up to choosing ρ_2 smaller, we can assume without loss of generality that

$$1-2^{\gamma+1}\rho_2>0.$$

The idea is to define a cutoff function which depends on the space between $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon$ and the line $\{(\frac{\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon}{2},\mathbb{R})\}$. Hence, we define

$$d(x_2)=\tfrac{d_\varepsilon}{2}+\tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}\rho_2|2x_2/\varepsilon|^{\gamma+1}$$

and we remark from (H2) that

$$\Big([-\tfrac{\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon}{2},-\tfrac{\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon}{2}+d(x_2)]\cup[\tfrac{\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon}{2}-d(x_2),\tfrac{\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon}{2}]\Big)\times\{x_2\}\subset\Big([-\tfrac{\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon}{2},\tfrac{\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon}{2}]\times[-\varepsilon,\varepsilon]\Big)\backslash\tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathcal{K}\text{ for all }x_2\in[-\varepsilon,\varepsilon].$$

Let $\varphi\in\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be a positive non-increasing function such that $\varphi(s)=1$ if $s\le 0$ and $\varphi(s)=0$ if $s\ge 1$. Then we introduce:

$$\varphi^\varepsilon(x)=\varphi\Big(\frac{2|x_2|-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\Big)\Big[1-\varphi\Big(\frac{(\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon)/2-x_1}{d(x_2)}\Big)-\varphi\Big(\frac{x_1+(\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon)/2}{d(x_2)}\Big)\Big]$$

We can check that $\varphi^\varepsilon(x)\in[0,1]$ for all $x\in\mathbb{R}^2$, that $\varphi^\varepsilon(x)=0$ for all $x\in([-\frac{\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon}{2},\frac{\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon}{2}]\times[-\varepsilon,\varepsilon])^c$ and that $\varphi^\varepsilon(x)=1$ in the neighborhood of $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathcal{K}$. Hence,

$$\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\le\sqrt{2\varepsilon(\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon)}.$$

Next, we see that for all x we have

$$|\nabla\varphi^\varepsilon(x)|\le\frac{C}{\varepsilon}+\frac{C}{d(x_2)}+\frac{Cd(x_2)}{d(x_2)^2}\le\frac{C}{\varepsilon}+\frac{C}{d(x_2)},$$

where we have used that on the support of $\varphi'\Big(\frac{(\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon)/2-x_1}{d(x_2)}\Big)$ we have $|(\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon)/2-x_1|\le d(x_2)$. So we compute:

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla\varphi^\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\le&C\Big(\frac{2\varepsilon(\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^2}+4\int_0^\varepsilon\int_0^{d(x_2)}\frac{1}{d(x_2)^2}\,dx_1dx_2\Big)^{1/2}\le C\Big(1+\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}+4\int_0^\varepsilon\frac{1}{d(x_2)}\,dx_2\Big)^{1/2}\\&\le C\Big(1+\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}+8\int_0^\varepsilon\frac{1}{d_\varepsilon+\varepsilon^{-\gamma}\rho_2(2x_2)^{\gamma+1}}\,dx_2\Big)^{1/2}\\&\le C\Big(1+\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}+8\int_0^\delta\frac{1}{d_\varepsilon}\,dx_2+2^{2-\gamma}\int_\delta^\varepsilon\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{-\gamma}\rho_2x_2^{\gamma+1}}\,dx_2\Big)^{1/2}\\&\le C\Big(1+\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}+8\frac{\delta}{d_\varepsilon}+\frac{2^{2-\gamma}}{\gamma\varepsilon^{-\gamma}\rho_2\delta^\gamma}\Big)^{1/2}\end{aligned}$$

where we choose $\delta\in(0,\varepsilon)$ such that $\frac{\delta}{d_\varepsilon}\le\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{-\gamma}\delta^\gamma}$, i.e. $\delta=\min(\varepsilon,(d_\varepsilon\varepsilon^\gamma)^{1/(\gamma+1)})$.

In the case where $d_\varepsilon\ge\varepsilon$, then we take $\delta=\varepsilon$ in the previous computation and we get

$$\|\nabla\varphi^\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\le C\Big(9+\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\Big)^{1/2}\le C+C\Big(\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\Big)^{1/2}$$

which implies by (3.13) and (3.14) that

$$\|K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[f]-v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}\le C\|f\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty}\Big(\frac{C\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}+\frac{C\varepsilon}{\sqrt{d_\varepsilon}}\Big(\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\Big)^{1/2}+\frac{\sqrt{2\varepsilon(\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon)}}{\sqrt{d_\varepsilon}}\Big)\le C\|f\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty}\sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

In the other case $d_\varepsilon<\varepsilon$, then we take $\delta=(d_\varepsilon\varepsilon^\gamma)^{1/(\gamma+1)}$ which gives

$$\|\nabla\varphi^\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\le C\Big(1+\frac{(d_\varepsilon\varepsilon^\gamma)^{1/(\gamma+1)}}{d_\varepsilon}\Big)^{1/2}\le C\Big(1+\Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{d_\varepsilon}\Big)^{\frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma+1)}}\Big).$$

Together with (3.13) and (3.14), we conclude that in this case

$$\begin{aligned}\|K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[f]-v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)}&\le C\|f\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty}\Big(\frac{C\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}+\frac{C\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{d_\varepsilon}\Big)^{\frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma+1)}}+\frac{\sqrt{2\varepsilon(\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon)}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\Big)\\&\le C\|f\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty}\sqrt{\varepsilon}\Big(1+\Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{d_\varepsilon}\Big)^{\frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma+1)}}\Big).\end{aligned}$$

This ends the proof of Proposition 2.3.

Remark 3.1. *For the Laplace, Stokes and Navier-Stokes problems, we do not have ε in front of $\|\sum_{i,j}\nabla\varphi^\varepsilon\|_{L^2}$. Finding φ^ε which minimizes $\|\nabla\varphi^\varepsilon\|_{L^2}$ is a standard problem in optimization, and it is well known that the minimizer is the solution of $\Delta\varphi^\varepsilon = 0$. In an annulus $B(0,d_\varepsilon)\setminus B(0,\varepsilon)$, the solution is*

$$\frac{\ln\frac{|x|}{d_\varepsilon}}{\ln\frac{\varepsilon}{d_\varepsilon}}$$

and we get in the case of inclusions distributed in the square, for $d_\varepsilon \gg \varepsilon$,

$$\|\sum_{i,j}\nabla\varphi^\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \le \frac{1}{d_\varepsilon}\Big(\ln\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\Big)^{-1/2} \le \frac{C}{d_\varepsilon|\ln\varepsilon|^{1/2}},$$

so the behavior depends on the limit of $d_\varepsilon|\ln\varepsilon|^{1/2}$ (see [1, 2, 8]*).*

When the inclusions are distributed on the segment, the number of obstacles is $N_\varepsilon \le C/d_\varepsilon$ and then

$$\|\sum_{i,j}\nabla\varphi^\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_\varepsilon}}\Big(\ln\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\Big)^{-1/2} \le \Big(\frac{C}{d_\varepsilon|\ln\varepsilon|}\Big)^{1/2},$$

where the limit $d_\varepsilon|\ln\varepsilon|$is the criterion in [2]*.*

For inviscid flow, thanks to the additional ε in (3.13)*, we manage to treat smaller distance than for viscous fluid. When the inclusions are distributed on the segment, we even deal with distance smaller than the inclusion size.*

Remark 3.2. *To obtain a correction, the basic idea could be to cutoff the stream function and then to define:*

$$\tilde v^\varepsilon[f](x) := \nabla^\perp\Big(\frac{1}{2\pi}\Big(1-\sum_{i,j}\varphi^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x)\Big)\int_{\Omega^\varepsilon}\ln|x-y|f(y)\,dy\Big)$$

which is divergence free, vanishing close to the boundary. Hence it verifies (2.5)*, but in this case, we could only have*

$$\|K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[f]-\tilde v^\varepsilon[f]\|_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \le C\|f\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty}\Big(\|\nabla\varphi^\varepsilon\|_{L^2}+\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\Big)\sqrt{\sum_{i,j}1},$$

which tends to zero only for large distances (see the previous remark).

The use of the Biot Savart law in the exterior of one inclusion allowed us to get the smallness of the stream function ψ^ε on the support of $\nabla\varphi^\varepsilon_{i,j}$. Nevertheless, there is another classical way to construct a compatible correction, as it used in [1, 2, 34] *and more recently in* [22]*. The general idea is to utilize a direct cut-off function on the velocity and a correction to restore the divergence-free condition, based on Bogovskiĭ operator. Namely, let us consider the case $d_\varepsilon \ge C_0\varepsilon$ for some $C_0>0$, and we use φ^ε independent of d_ε (see Case 1, just above). Then we define:*

$$\hat v^\varepsilon[f](x) := \Big(1-\sum_{i,j}\varphi^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x)\Big)K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[f]+h^\varepsilon$$

where h^ε is a solution of

$$\operatorname{div} h^\varepsilon = K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[f]\cdot\sum_{i,j}\nabla\varphi^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x).$$

By a dilatation argument and standard estimates for such a problem, we can prove the existence of h^ε which satisfies the same estimate than $\varphi^\varepsilon_{i,j}$, namely Lemma 2.1 in [22] *gives*

$$\|h^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \le C\|f\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty}\varepsilon\|\nabla\varphi^\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\sqrt{\sum_{i,j}1}.$$

Therefore, without using Biot Savart law in the exterior of one inclusion, we have in a much simpler way

$$\|K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[f]-\hat v^\varepsilon[f]\|_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} \le C\|f\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty}\Big(\varepsilon\|\nabla\varphi^\varepsilon\|_{L^2}+\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\Big)\sqrt{\sum_{i,j}1},$$

which gives the result when $d_\varepsilon \geq C_0\varepsilon$. In particular, this correction is sufficient for the case where the inclusions cover the square. This argument cannot be used when the distance is smaller than the size of the inclusions. For distances $d^\varepsilon \ll \varepsilon$, we would need to understand the behavior of the estimates of h^ε on domains of the form $(-1,1)^2\setminus\rho\mathcal{K}$ as $\rho\to 1^-$, which is a complicated question. This explains why [2, 22] *need to assume that size is still smaller than the inter-hole distance (see* [2, Equation (3.4.2)] *and* [22, Remark 2.1]*).*

To conclude, the use of the Biot Savart law in the exterior of one inclusion is necessary for distances smaller than the size of the inclusions, as in the case of inclusions distributed on the segment. As the estimates of $w_{i,j}^{k,\varepsilon}$ are the same for both cases, we have chosen here to keep the correction v^ε, even in the case where inclusions cover the square.

4. Impermeability for small distance

The goal of this section is to prove Proposition 2.5. We begin with the easier situation which is the case of inclusions distributed on the segment (1.4).

4.1. **Inclusions distributed on the segment.** In this subsection we consider Ω_1^ε in the case $d_\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon$ and a bounded sequence in $L^2_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, of divergence free vector fields v^ε which are tangent to the boundary $\partial\Omega_1^\varepsilon$. Let us fix $p\in C_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega_1})$.

For any $s\in(0,\rho_0]$, we connect all the inclusions by taking

$$\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s) := \Big(\bigcup_{i=1}^{N_\varepsilon}\mathcal{K}_{i,1}^\varepsilon\Big)\bigcup\Big([x_{1,1},x_{N_\varepsilon,1}]\times[-\tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}s,\tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}s]\Big),$$

where $x_{i,j}$ is the horizontal coordinate of $z_{i,j}$.

Due to the assumption (H2) on $\mathcal{K}$, we have

- $\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)$ is a simply connected compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^2$;
- $\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)\setminus\Big(\bigcup_{i=1}^{N_\varepsilon}\mathcal{K}_{i,1}^\varepsilon\Big) = \Omega_1^\varepsilon\cap\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)$ has $N_\varepsilon-1$ connected components whose Lebesgue measure can be estimated as follows:

  $$\mathcal{A}^\varepsilon(s) := \text{meas}\Big|\Omega^\varepsilon\cap\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)\Big| \leq (N_\varepsilon-1)\Big(\Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\Big)^2 4\int_0^s \rho_1 r^{1+\gamma}\,dr + \varepsilon s d_\varepsilon\Big) \leq C(\varepsilon s^{\gamma+2}+d_\varepsilon s),$$

  with C independent of ε (where we have used that $N_\varepsilon\leq 2/\varepsilon$).

See the left hand side picture of Figure 2 (page 27) to understand the space between the inclusions.

Unfortunately, we cannot state that the point $(1,0)$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)$. For this reason, we introduce a cutoff function

$$\chi\in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+),\quad \chi(r)=0 \text{ if } r\geq 2 \text{ and } \chi(r)=1 \text{ if } r\leq 1 \tag{4.1}$$

and for any $\eta>0$ we decompose p as

$$p(x) = \Big(1-\chi\Big(\frac{|x-(1,0)|}{\eta}\Big)\Big)p(x) + \chi\Big(\frac{|x-(1,0)|}{\eta}\Big)p(x) =: p_{1,\eta}(x)+p_{2,\eta}(x).$$

Before starting the actual proof, let us note that the main idea of the following analysis is to observe that

$$\int_{\Omega_1^\varepsilon\cap\Omega_1} v^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla p_{1,\eta}\,dx \approx \int_{\mathbb{R}^2\setminus\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)} v^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla p_{1,\eta}\,dx = \int_{\partial\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)\setminus\partial\Omega_1^\varepsilon} p_{1,\eta}v^\varepsilon\cdot n\,dx \quad \forall s.$$

Next we will integrate this equality on $s\in[0,s_\varepsilon]$ for some s_ε chosen later, and we estimate it by $\|p_{1,\eta}\|_{L^\infty}\|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2}(\mathcal{A}^\varepsilon(s_\varepsilon))^{1/2}$. We will conclude by finding the best s_ε (depending on γ) such that $\int_{\Omega_1^\varepsilon\cap\Omega_1} v^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla p_{1,\eta}\,dx$ tends to zero as $\varepsilon\to 0$.

More precisely, let us fix $\eta>0$ and prove the convergence with $p_{1,\eta}$. Thanks to (H2), we state that for ε small enough (namely, $\varepsilon<\eta$) we have

- $([0,1-\eta]\times\{0\})\subset\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)$ for any s.

As $p_{1,\eta} \equiv 0$ in $B((1,0),\eta)$, we deduce that $p_{1,\eta}$ is smooth in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)$ and may have a jump across $([0,1-\eta]\times\{0\})$. This remark is crucial for the following computation (and this explains the introduction of the cutoff). Using that v^ε is tangent to $\partial\Omega^\varepsilon$ and that $p_{1,\eta}$ is smooth on $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)$, we compute for any $s \in (0, s_\varepsilon)$, with s_ε to be determined later such that $s_\varepsilon \le \rho_0$:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Omega_1^\varepsilon\cap\Omega_1} v^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla p_{1,\eta}\,dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2\setminus\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)} v^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla p_{1,\eta}\,dx + \int_{\Omega_1^\varepsilon\cap\Omega_1\cap\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)} v^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla p_{1,\eta}\,dx\\ &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)\setminus\partial\Omega_1^\varepsilon} p_{1,\eta}v^\varepsilon\cdot n\,dx + \int_{\Omega_1^\varepsilon\cap\Omega_1\cap\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)} v^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla p_{1,\eta}\,dx\end{aligned}$$

where n is equal to $\pm e_2$. Moreover, $\partial\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)\setminus\partial\Omega_1^\varepsilon$ has $2(N_\varepsilon-1)$ connected components, which are horizontal segments linking $\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon_{i,1}$ and $\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon_{i+1,1}$, and included in the lines $([0,1]\times\{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}s\})$ and $([0,1]\times\{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}s\})$. Now, we integrate the above equality for $s\in(0,s_\varepsilon)$:

$$s_\varepsilon\int_{\Omega_1^\varepsilon\cap\Omega_1} v^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla p_{1,\eta}\,dx = \int_0^{s_\varepsilon}\int_{\partial\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)\setminus\partial\Omega_1^\varepsilon} p_{1,\eta}v^\varepsilon\cdot n\,dxds + \int_0^{s_\varepsilon}\int_{\Omega_1^\varepsilon\cap\Omega_1\cap\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)} v^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla p_{1,\eta}\,dxds. \tag{4.2}$$

Changing variable $s'=\frac{\varepsilon s}{2}$, the first right hand side term can be estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}s_\varepsilon^{-1}\Big|\int_0^{s_\varepsilon}\int_{\partial\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)\setminus\partial\Omega_1^\varepsilon} p_{1,\eta}v^\varepsilon\cdot n\,dxds\Big| &= 2(\varepsilon s_\varepsilon)^{-1}\Big|\int_0^{\varepsilon s_\varepsilon/2}\int_{\partial\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(2s'/\varepsilon)\setminus\partial\Omega_1^\varepsilon} p_{1,\eta}v^\varepsilon\cdot n\,dxds'\Big|\\ &\le 2(\varepsilon s_\varepsilon)^{-1}\int_{\Omega_1^\varepsilon\cap\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s_\varepsilon)} |p_{1,\eta}||v^\varepsilon|\,dx\\ &\le 2(\varepsilon s_\varepsilon)^{-1}\|p_{1,\eta}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_1)}\|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_1^\varepsilon\cap\ \mathrm{supp}\ p)}\Big(\mathcal{A}^\varepsilon(s_\varepsilon)\Big)^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Now we choose s_ε such that $\frac{\mathcal{A}^\varepsilon(s_\varepsilon)}{(\varepsilon s_\varepsilon)^2}\le C(\frac{s_\varepsilon^\gamma}{\varepsilon}+\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^2 s_\varepsilon})$ is minimal, i.e. $s_\varepsilon=(\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\gamma\varepsilon})^{1/(\gamma+1)}$ for $\gamma<\infty$ (which is smaller than ρ_0 for ε small enough) and $s_\varepsilon=\rho_0$ for $\gamma=\infty$.

In both case, we have

$$s_\varepsilon^{-1}\Big|\int_0^{s_\varepsilon}\int_{\partial\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)\setminus\partial\Omega_1^\varepsilon} p_{1,\eta}v^\varepsilon\cdot n\,dxds\Big| \le C\|p_{1,\eta}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_1)}\|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_1^\varepsilon\cap\ \mathrm{supp}\ p)}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\Big(\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\Big)^{\frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma+1)}}.$$

For the second right hand side term of (4.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}s_\varepsilon^{-1}\Big|\int_0^{s_\varepsilon}\int_{\Omega_1^\varepsilon\cap\Omega_1\cap\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)} v^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla p_{1,\eta}\,dxds\Big| &\le \int_{\Omega_1^\varepsilon\cap\Omega_1\cap\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s_\varepsilon)} |v^\varepsilon||\nabla p_{1,\eta}|\,dx\\ &\le \|\nabla p_{1,\eta}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_1)}\|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_1^\varepsilon\cap\ \mathrm{supp}\ p)}(\varepsilon s_\varepsilon)(\varepsilon s_\varepsilon)^{-1}\Big(\mathcal{A}^\varepsilon(s_\varepsilon)\Big)^{1/2}\\ &\le C\|p\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_1)}\|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_1^\varepsilon\cap\ \mathrm{supp}\ p)}d_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}}\varepsilon^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+1}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\Big(\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\Big)^{\frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma+1)}}.\end{aligned}$$

Bringing together these two estimates with (4.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\int_{\Omega_1^\varepsilon\cap\Omega_1} v^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla p_{1,\eta}\,dx\Big| &\le C\|p\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_1)}\|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_1^\varepsilon\cap\ \mathrm{supp}\ p)}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\Big(\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\Big)^{\frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma+1)}}\\ &\le C\|p\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_1)}\|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_1^\varepsilon\cap\ \mathrm{supp}\ p)}\left(\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{2+\frac{1}{\gamma}}}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma+1)}},\end{aligned}$$

which tends to zero (under the assumptions of Proposition 2.5).

We conclude now with p. As v^ε is bounded in $L^2(\Omega_1\cap\mathrm{supp}\ p)$, we can extract a subsequence such that its converges weakly to v. So, for every $\eta>0$,

$$\int_{\Omega_1} v^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla p_{2,\eta}\,dx \to \int_{\Omega_1} v\cdot\nabla p_{2,\eta}\,dx \quad \text{as } \varepsilon\to 0.$$

Moreover, as $\nabla p_{2,\eta}$ converges weakly to zero in L^2 when $\eta \to 0$, we conclude that for any $\delta > 0$, there exists η such that

$$\Big| \int_{\Omega_1} v \cdot \nabla p_{2,\eta}\, dx \Big| \leq \delta/3$$

and for this η, there exists ε_η such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_\eta]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Big| \int_{\Omega_1} v^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla p\, dx \Big| &\leq \Big| \int_{\Omega_1} v^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla p_{1,\eta}\, dx \Big| + \Big| \int_{\Omega_1} v^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla p_{2,\eta}\, dx \Big| \\ &\leq \frac{\delta}{3} + \Big| \int_{\Omega_1} v \cdot \nabla p_{2,\eta}\, dx \Big| + \frac{\delta}{3} \leq \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have proved that for any sequence $\varepsilon_n \to 0$, we can extract a subsequence such that $\int_{\Omega_1} v^{\varepsilon_{\psi(n)}} \cdot \nabla p\, dx$ tends to zero. By uniqueness of this limit, we deduce that the above convergence holds for the full sequence, without extraction.

This ends the proof of the first point of Proposition 2.5.

4.2. **Inclusions distributed on the square.** We consider Ω_2^ε (1.3) in the case $d_\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon$ and a bounded sequence in $L^2_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, of divergence free vector fields v^ε which are tangent to the boundary $\partial\Omega_2^\varepsilon$. Let us fix $p \in C_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega_2})$ which is extended by zero in $(0,1)^2$.

We use the cutoff (4.1) in the neighborhood of the four corners: for any $\eta > 0$ fixed, we decompose p as

$$\begin{aligned} p(x) =& \Big(1 - \chi\Big(\frac{|x-(1,0)|}{\eta}\Big) - \chi\Big(\frac{|x|}{\eta}\Big) - \chi\Big(\frac{|x-(0,1)|}{\eta}\Big) - \chi\Big(\frac{|x-(1,1)|}{\eta}\Big)\Big) p(x) \\ &+ \Big(\chi\Big(\frac{|x-(1,0)|}{\eta}\Big) + \chi\Big(\frac{|x|}{\eta}\Big) + \chi\Big(\frac{|x-(0,1)|}{\eta}\Big) + \chi\Big(\frac{|x-(1,1)|}{\eta}\Big)\Big) p(x) \\ =:& p_{1,\eta}(x) + p_{2,\eta}(x), \end{aligned}$$

and the core of the analysis is to prove that

$$\int_{\Omega_2} v^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla p_{1,\eta}\, dx \to 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

Up to using other cutoffs, we can assume that $p_{1,\eta}$ is equal to zero in the neighborhood of three sides of the square. For instance, let us assume that $p_{1,\eta}$ vanishes except around the bottom side $(0,1) \times \{0\}$.

As $\partial\mathcal{K}$ is C^1, there exist $\gamma > 0$, $\rho_0, \rho_1 > 0$ such that

$$\Big([-(1-\rho_1|s|^{1+\gamma}), -(1-\rho_1\rho_0^{1+\gamma})] \cup [(1-\rho_1\rho_0^{1+\gamma}), (1-\rho_1|s|^{1+\gamma})]\Big) \times \{s\} \subset \mathcal{K}$$

for all $s \in [-\rho_0, \rho_0]$. For simplicity, let assume that the entire segment $[-(1-\rho_1|s|^{1+\gamma}), (1-\rho_1|s|^{1+\gamma})] \times \{s\} \subset \mathcal{K}$ for all $s \in [-\rho_0, \rho_0]$ (see the discussion in the final section).

The main idea is to see the side $[0,1] \times \{0\}$ as the limit of $2N'+1$ lines of inclusions where we set

$$N' = \Big[\Big(\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\Big)^{\frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma+1)}} \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\Big], \tag{4.3}$$

and to use the area between $\mathcal{K}_{i,j}^\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{K}_{i+1,j}^\varepsilon$ in each lines $j = 1, \dots, 2N'+1$.

Let us first note that the case $N' = 0$, i.e. $\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{2+\frac{1}{\gamma}}} < \varepsilon$ is already covered by the previous analysis: the fluid cannot penetrated though one line of obstacles. So, for the rest of this section, we consider the case $N' \geq 1$. We also remark that $2N'+1 \ll N_\varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon)$ because we assume in this subsection that $\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \to 0$. Hence we have for ε small enough that

- $\mathcal{K}_{1,j}^\varepsilon \subset B(0,\eta)$ and $\mathcal{K}_{N_\varepsilon,j}^\varepsilon \subset B((1,0),\eta)$ for all $j = 1, \dots, 2N'+1$.

For any $s \in [-\rho_0, \rho_0]$ and $k = 1, \dots, N'$, we connect the inclusions between the lines $N'+1-k$ and $N'+1+k$:

$$\mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(s) := \Big(\bigcup_{i=1}^{N_\varepsilon} \bigcup_{j=N'+1-k}^{N'+1+k} \mathcal{K}_{i,j}^\varepsilon\Big) \bigcup \Big([x_{1,1}, x_{N_\varepsilon,1}] \times [y_{1,N'+1-k} - \tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}s, y_{1,N'+1+k} + \tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}s])\Big).$$

where $y_{i,j}$ is the vertical coordinate of $z_{i,j}$. Hence, we have for any $k = 1, \dots, N'$:

- for all $s \in [-\rho_0, \rho_0]$, $\mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(s)$ is a simply connected compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^2$;
- for all $s \in (0, \rho_0]$, $\Big(\mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(s) \setminus \mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(-s)\Big) \setminus \Big(B(0,\eta) \cup B((1,0),\eta)\Big)$ has less than $2(N_\varepsilon - 1)$ connected components whose Lebesgue measure can be estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_k^\varepsilon(s) &:= \mathrm{meas}\Big|\Big(\mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(s) \setminus \mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(-s)\Big) \setminus \Big(B(0,\eta) \cup B((1,0),\eta)\Big)\Big| \\ &\le 2(N_\varepsilon - 1)\Big(\Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{4}\Big)^2 4\int_0^s \rho_1 r^{1+\gamma}\, dr + \varepsilon s d_\varepsilon\Big) \le C(\varepsilon s^{\gamma+2} + d_\varepsilon s),\end{aligned}$$

with C independent of ε.

As in the case of one line of obstacles, we can show that the best choice is $s_\varepsilon = (\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\gamma\varepsilon})^{1/(\gamma+1)}$ for $\gamma < \infty$ (which belongs to $(0, \rho_0)$ for ε small enough) and $s_\varepsilon = \rho_0$ for $\gamma = \infty$. Hence we have

$$\mathcal{A}_k^\varepsilon(s_\varepsilon) \le 2C d_\varepsilon s_\varepsilon. \tag{4.4}$$

Here too, it is important for the following argument that the jump of the test function can occur only in $\mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(s)$, so let us note that

- $\tilde{p}_{1,\eta} := p_{1,\eta}(\cdot - (0, y_{1,N'+1}))$ is smooth on $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(s_\varepsilon)$ for all $s \in [-\rho_0, \rho_0]$ and $k = 1, \dots, N'$.

Now, we use that v^ε is tangent to $\partial\Omega_2^\varepsilon$ to compute for any $s \in (-s_\varepsilon, s_\varepsilon)$ and $k = 1, \dots, N'$:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Omega_2^\varepsilon} v^\varepsilon \cdot \widehat{\nabla\tilde{p}_{1,\eta}}\, dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(s)} v^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla\tilde{p}_{1,\eta}\, dx + \int_{\Omega_2^\varepsilon \cap \mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(s)} v^\varepsilon \cdot \widehat{\nabla\tilde{p}_{1,\eta}}\, dx \\ &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(s) \setminus \partial\Omega_2^\varepsilon} \tilde{p}_{1,\eta} v^\varepsilon \cdot n\, dx + \int_{\Omega_2^\varepsilon \cap \mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(s)} v^\varepsilon \cdot \widehat{\nabla\tilde{p}_{1,\eta}}\, dx\end{aligned}$$

where n is equal to $\pm e_2$ and where $\widehat{\nabla\tilde{p}_{1,\eta}}$ is the extension of $\nabla\tilde{p}_{1,\eta}$ by zero for $y \ge y_{1,N'+1}$. Moreover, $(\partial\mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(s) \setminus \partial\Omega_2^\varepsilon) \cap \mathrm{supp}\ \tilde{p}_{1,\eta}$ has less than $2(N_\varepsilon - 1)$ connected components, which are horizontal segments linking $\mathcal{K}_{i,j}^\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{K}_{i+1,j}^\varepsilon$ for $j = N' + 1 \pm k$, and included in the lines $([0,1] \times \{y_{1,N'+1+k} + \varepsilon s\})$ and $([0,1] \times \{y_{1,N'+1-k} - \varepsilon s\})$. Now, we integrate the above equality for $s \in (-s_\varepsilon, s_\varepsilon)$ and sum on $k = 1, \dots, N'$

$$\begin{aligned}N'(2s_\varepsilon)\int_{\Omega_2^\varepsilon} v^\varepsilon \cdot \widehat{\nabla\tilde{p}_{1,\eta}}\, dx = &\sum_{k=1}^{N'} \int_{-s_\varepsilon}^{s_\varepsilon} \int_{\partial\mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(s) \setminus \partial\Omega_2^\varepsilon} \tilde{p}_{1,\eta} v^\varepsilon \cdot n\, dx ds \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^{N'} \int_{-s_\varepsilon}^{s_\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega_2^\varepsilon \cap \mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(s)} v^\varepsilon \cdot \widehat{\nabla\tilde{p}_{1,\eta}}\, dx ds.\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

Changing variable $s' = \frac{\varepsilon s}{2}$, the first right hand side term can be estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\int_{-s_\varepsilon}^{s_\varepsilon} \int_{\partial\mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(s) \setminus \partial\Omega_2^\varepsilon} \tilde{p}_{1,\eta} v^\varepsilon \cdot n\, dx ds\Big| &= 2\varepsilon^{-1}\Big|\int_{-\varepsilon s_\varepsilon/2}^{\varepsilon s_\varepsilon/2} \int_{\partial\mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(2s'/\varepsilon) \setminus \partial\Omega_2^\varepsilon} \tilde{p}_{1,\eta} v^\varepsilon \cdot n\, dx ds'\Big| \\ &\le 2\varepsilon^{-1}\int_{\mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(s_\varepsilon) \setminus \mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(-s_\varepsilon)} |\tilde{p}_{1,\eta}||v^\varepsilon|\, dx.\end{aligned}$$

As $(\mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(s_\varepsilon)\setminus\mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(-s_\varepsilon))\cap(\mathcal{C}_{k'}^\varepsilon(s_\varepsilon)\setminus\mathcal{C}_{k'}^\varepsilon(-s_\varepsilon))\cap(\operatorname{supp}\tilde{p}_{1,\eta})=\emptyset$ if $k'\neq k$, the sum becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}(N's_\varepsilon)^{-1}\Big|\sum_{k=1}^{N'}\int_{-s_\varepsilon}^{s_\varepsilon}\int_{\partial\mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(s)\setminus\partial\Omega_2^\varepsilon}\tilde{p}_{1,\eta}v^\varepsilon\cdot n\,dxds\Big| &\le (N's_\varepsilon\varepsilon)^{-1}\|p_{1,\eta}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_2)}\|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_2^\varepsilon\cap\operatorname{supp}\tilde{p}_{1,\eta})}\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{N'}\mathcal{A}_k^\varepsilon(s_\varepsilon)\Big)^{1/2}\\ &\le C\Big(\frac{d_\varepsilon}{N's_\varepsilon\varepsilon^2}\Big)^{1/2}\|p_{1,\eta}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_2)}\|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_2^\varepsilon\cap\operatorname{supp}\tilde{p}_{1,\eta})}\\ &\le C\sqrt{2}\Big(\frac{d_\varepsilon}{(N'+1)s_\varepsilon\varepsilon^2}\Big)^{1/2}\|p_{1,\eta}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_2)}\|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_2^\varepsilon\cap\operatorname{supp}\tilde{p}_{1,\eta})}\\ &\le C\Big(\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\Big)^{\frac{\gamma}{4(\gamma+1)}}\|p_{1,\eta}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_2)}\|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_2^\varepsilon\cap\operatorname{supp}\tilde{p}_{1,\eta})}\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (4.4) and (4.3). We can remark in the previous computation that we introduce cutoff functions close to the corners of the square to avoid integrals between $\mathcal{K}_{1,j}^\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{K}_{1,j+1}^\varepsilon$.

For the second right hand side term of (4.5), we state

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\sum_{k=1}^{N'}\int_{-s_\varepsilon}^{s_\varepsilon}\int_{\Omega_2^\varepsilon\cap\mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(s)}v^\varepsilon\cdot\widehat{\nabla\tilde{p}_{1,\eta}}\,dxds\Big| &\le N'(2s_\varepsilon)\int_{\Omega_2^\varepsilon\cap\mathcal{C}_{N'}^\varepsilon(s_\varepsilon)}|v^\varepsilon||\widehat{\nabla\tilde{p}_{1,\eta}}|\,dx\\ &\le N'(2s_\varepsilon)\|\nabla p_{1,\eta}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_2)}\|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_2^\varepsilon\cap\operatorname{supp}\tilde{p}_{1,\eta})}\Big(C(\varepsilon+d_\varepsilon)N'\Big)^{1/2}\\ &\le N'(2s_\varepsilon)C\|p_{1,\eta}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_2)}\|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_2^\varepsilon\cap\operatorname{supp}\tilde{p}_{1,\eta})}\Big(\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\Big)^{\frac{\gamma}{4(\gamma+1)}}.\end{aligned}$$

Bringing together these two estimates with (4.5), we have

$$\Big|\int_{\Omega_2^\varepsilon}v^\varepsilon\cdot\widehat{\nabla\tilde{p}_{1,\eta}}\,dx\Big|\le C\|p_{1,\eta}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_2)}\|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_2^\varepsilon\cap\operatorname{supp}\tilde{p}_{1,\eta})}\Big(\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\Big)^{\frac{\gamma}{4(\gamma+1)}},$$

which goes to zero as $\varepsilon\to0$ (under the assumption of Proposition 2.5).

Hence, we deduce that

$$\Big|\int_{\Omega_2}v^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla p_{1,\eta}\,dx\Big|\le\Big|\int_{\Omega_2^\varepsilon}v^\varepsilon\cdot\widehat{\nabla\tilde{p}_{1,\eta}}\,dx\Big|+\|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\operatorname{supp}p_{1,\eta}\cup\operatorname{supp}\tilde{p}_{1,\eta})}\|\widehat{\nabla p_{1,\eta}}(\cdot)-\widehat{\nabla p_{1,\eta}}(\cdot-(0,y_{1,N'+1}))\|_{L^2}$$

tends to zero when $\varepsilon\to0$, because $y_{1,N'+1}\le2\varepsilon(N'+1)\to0$. In the previous estimate, $\widehat{\nabla p_{1,\eta}}$ is equal to $\nabla p_{1,\eta}$ for $y<0$ and to zero for $y\ge0$, which belongs to L^2.

Finally, we conclude with $p=p_{1,\eta}(x)+p_{2,\eta}$ exactly in the way than the case where the obstacles are distributed on the segment: for any $\delta>0$, there exists η and ε_η such that for any $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_\eta]$:

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\int_{\Omega_2}v^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla p\,dx\Big| &\le\Big|\int_{\Omega_2}v^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla p_{1,\eta}\,dx\Big|+\Big|\int_{\Omega_2}v^\varepsilon\cdot\nabla p_{2,\eta}\,dx\Big|\\ &\le\frac{\delta}{3}+\Big|\int_{\Omega_2}v\cdot\nabla p_{2,\eta}\,dx\Big|+\frac{\delta}{3}\le\delta\end{aligned}$$

This ends the proof of Proposition 2.5.

5. Final remarks and comments

5.1. **Weaker assumptions on the shape.** In this subsection, we discuss how to decrease the assumption (H2).

The goal of (H2) is to construct a good cutoff function supported between the inclusions (see Subsection 3.3) for the permeability result, and to compute the area between two inclusions (see Section 4) for the impermeability result.

For both arguments, it is not necessary to assume:



FIGURE 2. Area between two inclusions.

- the symmetry assumption on $\partial\mathcal{K}$ around $(1,0)$ (it was written only for clarity). For example, let us consider the case where $[-(1-\rho_1|s|^{1+\gamma_1}),(1-\rho_1|s|^{1+\gamma_1})]\times\{s\}\subset\mathcal{K}$ for all $s\in[0,\rho_0]$ and $[-(1-\rho_2|s|^{1+\gamma_2}),(1-\rho_2|s|^{1+\gamma_2})]\times\{s\}\subset\mathcal{K}$ for all $s\in[-\rho_0,0]$ with $\gamma_1>\gamma_2$ (see the right hand side picture of Figure 2). If we perform the proof of Proposition 2.5 with the area between the lines $y=\frac{\varepsilon}{2}s_\varepsilon$ and $y=-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}s_\varepsilon$, we would obtain the impermeability as if $\gamma=\gamma_2=\min(\gamma_1,\gamma_2)$ which is not optimal. At the opposite, if we perform the proof with the area between the lines $y=\frac{\varepsilon}{2}s_\varepsilon$ and $y=0$, then we get that the asymptotic behavior depends on the limit of $d_\varepsilon/\varepsilon^{2+\frac{1}{\gamma_1}}$.
- that the segment $[(-1,0),(1,0)]\subset\mathcal{K}$. This assumption simplified the construction of $\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s)$ with is the connexion of $\mathcal{K}_{i,1}$ (see Section 4). Without this assumption, we should define $\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon(s):=\cup\mathcal{K}_{i,1}\cup A_i$, where A_i is the area between $\mathcal{K}_{i,1}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{i+1,1}$.
- that $(\pm1,0),(0,\pm1)\in\partial\mathcal{K}$. Without this assumption, we have to change sightly (1.2) such that the distance between $\mathcal{K}_{i,j}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{i+1,j}$ (and between $\mathcal{K}_{i,j}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{i,j+1}$) is d_ε. Next, we should consider the coefficient γ around the closest points, with respect to an axis which can be not horizontal. In the same spirit, we can also distribute the inclusions on any Jordan arc or on any compact set with no empty interior.
- that the inclusions have the same shape (see (1.1)). For instance, we can consider a finite number of possible shapes $(\mathcal{K}^1,\dots,\mathcal{K}^M)$, and we distribute the inclusions on the square:

$$\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon_{i,j}:=z^\varepsilon_{i,j}+\tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathcal{K}^{p_{i,j}}\text{ with }p_{i,j}\in\{1,\dots,M\}.$$

  In this case, considering uniform constants to estimate every conformal mappings $\mathcal{T}^1,\dots,\mathcal{T}^M$, we can adapt the permeability part. For the impermeability result, it is enough to set $\gamma=\min(\gamma^1,\dots,\gamma^M)$. Therefore, Theorem 1.1 would remain unchanged.

  In contrast, the case of inclusions distributed on the segment is more complicated. It is clear that we get the permeability if $\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{2+\frac{1}{\max\gamma^{p_{i,j}}}}}\to\infty$ and impermeability if $\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{2+\frac{1}{\min\gamma^{p_{i,j}}}}}\to0$, but it leaves aside many configurations. For example, if we distribute squares ($\gamma^1=\infty$) in the first half part of the segment and disks ($\gamma^2=1$) in the second part, then we guess that for $\varepsilon^3\ll d_\varepsilon\ll\varepsilon^2$ we obtain at the limit the Euler solution in the exterior of the half segment (i.e. the fluid cannot penetrate the part with the squares while it does not feel the presence of the disks).

Another possible extension (which is less easier) is the case where the obstacle has a corner i.e. $\gamma=0$. In this case, we could expect that the fluid is never perturbed by the porous medium if the obstacles are distributed on the segment. Actually, the cutoff function constructed in this paper should be sufficient in this setting, but the difficulty here is to perform the estimate of $w^{k,\varepsilon}_{i,j}$. On the one hand, when $\gamma>0$, the boundary is $C^{1,\beta}$ which implies that the conformal mapping $\mathcal{T}$ from $\mathcal{K}^c$ to the exterior of the unit disk has a bounded derivative up to the boundary (Kellogg-Warschawski theorem). On the other hand, outside a corner, $D\mathcal{T}$ blows up in the neighborhood of the corner. The

explicit form of this blow up is well-known by elliptic estimates in domains with piecewise smooth boundaries (see e.g. [6, 18]) and should be used to perform this extension.

Next, the same question could be investigated when the inclusions are distributed on the square.

5.2. **Infinite number of lines shrinking to the segment.** Another possible extension is the case where we consider several lines of obstacles, but in a thin region which shrinks to the segment. For example, let us introduce a parameter $\mu \in (0,1)$, and we consider $N_{2,\varepsilon} := [(1/\varepsilon)^\mu]$ lines of obstacles separated by a vertical distance ε and by an horizontal distance d_ε, i.e.

$$z_{i,j}^\varepsilon = (\tfrac{\varepsilon}{2} + (i-1)(\varepsilon + d_\varepsilon), (j-1)2\varepsilon) = (\tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}, 0) + (\varepsilon + d_\varepsilon)(i-1, 0) + 2\varepsilon(0, j-1), \\ i = 1, \dots, N_\varepsilon,\ j = 1, \dots, N_{2,\varepsilon}. \quad (5.1)$$

Therefore, the obstacles are included in the rectangle $[0,1] \times [-\varepsilon/2, 2\varepsilon^{1-\mu}]$ which shrinks to the unit segment as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

In this situation, the only difference in the permeability analysis is that

$$\sqrt{\sum_{i,j} 1} = \sqrt{N_\varepsilon N_{2,\varepsilon}} \le \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{\mu/2}} \min\Big(\sqrt{\frac{2}{\varepsilon}}, \sqrt{\frac{2}{d_\varepsilon}}\Big),$$

so using the same cutoff than in the case of a line, we get from (3.13) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[f] - v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega^\varepsilon)} &\le C\|f\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty} \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon^{\mu/2}} \Big(1 + \Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{d_\varepsilon}\Big)^{\frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma+1)}}\Big) \\ &\le C\|f\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty} \Big(\varepsilon^{(1-\mu)/2} + \Big(\frac{\varepsilon^{1+(1-\mu)(1+\frac{1}{\gamma})}}{d_\varepsilon}\Big)^{\frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma+1)}}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

This allows us to prove the permeability in the case where $\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{1+(1-\mu)(1+\frac{1}{\gamma})}} \to \infty$. For $\mu = 0$, we recover the criterion for one line $\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{2+\frac{1}{\gamma}}}$ whereas for $\mu = 1$ we get the criterion corresponding to inclusions distributed on the square: $\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}$.

Following Section 4.2 with $N' = [(N_{2,\varepsilon} - 1)/2]$, it is also possible to adapt the impermeability result when $\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{1+(1-\mu)(1+\frac{1}{\gamma})}} \to 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} (N' s_\varepsilon)^{-1} \Big| \sum_{k=1}^{N'} \int_{-s_\varepsilon}^{s_\varepsilon} \int_{\partial \mathcal{C}_k^\varepsilon(s) \setminus \partial\Omega^\varepsilon} \tilde{p}_{1,\eta} v^\varepsilon \cdot n \, dx ds \Big| &\le C\sqrt{2} \Big(\frac{d_\varepsilon}{(N'+1)s_\varepsilon \varepsilon^2}\Big)^{1/2} \|p_{1,\eta}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_2)} \|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_2^\varepsilon \cap \operatorname{supp} \tilde{p}_{1,\eta})} \\ &\le C\Big(\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{1+(1-\mu)(1+\frac{1}{\gamma})}}\Big)^{\frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma+1)}} \|p_{1,\eta}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_2)} \|v^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_2^\varepsilon \cap \operatorname{supp} \tilde{p}_{1,\eta})}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have the following.

Corollary 5.1. *Assume that $\mathcal{K}$ verifies* (H1)-(H2) *and let $\mu \in [0,1)$. Let $\omega_0 \in L_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $(u^\varepsilon, \omega^\varepsilon)$ be the global weak solution to the Euler equations* (1.5)-(1.9) *on*

$$\Omega_\mu^\varepsilon := \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{i=1}^{N_\varepsilon} \bigcup_{j=1}^{N_{2,\varepsilon}} \mathcal{K}_{i,j}^\varepsilon \Big) \quad \textit{(with } \mathcal{K}_{i,j}^\varepsilon \textit{ defined in } (1.1) \textit{ and } (5.1)\textit{)},$$

with initial vorticity $\omega_0|_{\Omega^\varepsilon}$ and initial circulations 0 around the inclusions (see (1.10)*).*

(i) *If*

$$\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{1+(1-\mu)(1+\frac{1}{\gamma})}} \to \infty \quad \textit{for a sequence } \varepsilon \to 0$$

then

- *$u^\varepsilon \to u$ strongly in $L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\omega^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \omega$ weak $*$ in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^2)$;*
- *the limit pair (u, ω) is the unique global solution to the Euler equations in the whole plane $\mathbb{R}^2$, with initial vorticity ω_0.*

(ii) *If*

$$\frac{d_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^{1+(1-\mu)(1+\frac{1}{\gamma})}} \to 0 \quad \text{for a sequence } \varepsilon \to 0$$

then there exists a subsequence such that

- $u^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u$ *weak* $*$ *in* $L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus ([0,1]\times\{0\})))$ *and* $\omega^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \omega$ *weak* $*$ *in* $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+ \times (\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus ([0,1]\times\{0\})))$*;*
- *the limit pair* (u,ω) *is a global weak solution to the Euler equations in* $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus ([0,1]\times\{0\})$*, with* $u\cdot n = 0$ *on the boundary, with initial vorticity* ω_0 *and initial circulation* 0 *around the segment.*

5.3. **Non-uniform continuity of the Leray projection.** For the permeability part and the impermeability part, the L^2 space plays a special role, due to the orthogonality of the Leray projector in this framework. In this case, we state that the projector is uniformly continuous (1-lipschitz) no matter of the domain (even if there is more and more inclusions with tiny size). The natural question is to wonder if this projector is uniformly continuous in the L^p framework for $p \neq 2$. Let us show that it is not the case for $p < 2$ and $d_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\alpha$ with $\alpha > 2$.

We consider the case of flat inclusions ($\gamma = \infty$) distributed on the segment. In the permeability part, the idea is to take advantage of the explicit formula of a correction v^ε to prove that $K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon] - v^\varepsilon$ tends to zero in L^2 for $\alpha < 2$ and to conclude because $u^\varepsilon - v^\varepsilon$ is the Leray projection in Ω^ε of $K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon] - v^\varepsilon$. However, for $p < 2$ we can find some $\alpha > 2$ for which $K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega^\varepsilon] - v^\varepsilon$ tends to zero in L^p. This is an easy consequence of the analysis of Section 3: the convergence of $\sum_i \varphi^\varepsilon_{i,1}(x)(w^{3,\varepsilon}_{i,1} + w^{4,\varepsilon}_{i,1})$ to zero holds for any p, and considering a basic cutoff function (see e.g. [5]) the second part could be estimated as

$$\Big\| \sum_i \nabla^\perp \varphi^\varepsilon_{i,j}(x)(w^{1,\varepsilon}_{i,j} + w^{2,\varepsilon}_{i,j}) \Big\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{d_\varepsilon}\Big(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\varepsilon d_\varepsilon\Big)^{1/p} \leq \varepsilon^{1-\alpha(1-\frac{1}{p})}.$$

We recover that for $p = 2$, we should have $\alpha < 2$, but for any $p \in [1,2)$, we can find $\alpha > 2$ such that the right hand side term tends to zero. If the Leray projector is uniformly continuous in $L^p(\Omega^\varepsilon_1)$, it would imply that the limit of u^ε is the solution without influence of the porous medium. This is in contradiction with the point (ii) of Theorem 1.2 where a wall appears.

Working on inclusions distributed on the square, we could also provide a counter example with $\alpha > 1$. This is interesting because in the case of $\alpha = 1$, the Leray projector is uniformly continuous in L^p for any p (see [28]).

5.4. **Paradox with the Kelvin theorem.** The Kelvin theorem states that the circulation around an inclusion is conserved for $t > 0$. Therefore, if we consider an inclusion which shrinks to a point with zero initial circulation, at the limit the circulation around the point is zero (see e.g. [16, 21, 26]).

With zero initial circulation, the circulation of an inviscid flow around the unit segment (see [19]) stays also zero. However, if we compute the curl of u, there is a measure supported on the curve $g(s,t)\delta$ where δ is the Dirac function on the segment $[0,1]\times\{0\}$. The density $g(s,t)$ is the jump of the tangential part and depends on time. The total circulation around the segment $\int g(\cdot,t)$ is equal to zero but g is not zero in general. The presence of g is important in order that $u = K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega + g(t)\delta]$ is tangent to the boundary, while there is no reason that $K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega]$ is tangent. Hence the density g at a point $x \in [0,1]\times\{0\}$ changes in order to counterbalance the normal part of $K_{\mathbb{R}^2}[\omega]$ and its total mass is zero. The connectedness of the segment allows this transfer of vorticity from one point to another of the segment.

If we think the segment as an infinite number of points, the Kelvin theorem can appear in contradiction with the part (ii) of Theorem 1.2. Nevertheless, the Kelvin theorem states only that the velocity at the point $x^\varepsilon_{i,0} \pm (\varepsilon, 0)$ may be non zero (in particular if $u^{up} \neq u^{down}$) in order that the circulation around is zero. We have established that there is no average flux ($\int u^{up}\cdot e_2\varphi = \int u^{down}\cdot e_2\varphi = 0$ for any $\varphi \in C^\infty_c([0,1]\times\{0\})$), but there are maybe some vertical velocities close to the inclusions.

Actually, this remark raises another interesting question which is to understand the convergence with higher norms and to get the first order of $u^\varepsilon - u$.

Acknowledgements. The first author is partially supported by the ANR Project DYFICOLTI grant ANR-13-BS01-0003-01 and by the Project "Instabilities in Hydrodynamics" funded by Paris city hall (program "Emergences") and the Fondation Sciences Mathématiques de Paris. The second author is partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1211806.

The authors are grateful to the anonymous referees for their valuable comments on the first version of this article which led to a substantial improvement of this work.

References

[1] G. Allaire. Homogenization of the Navier-Stokes equations in open sets perforated with tiny holes. I. Abstract framework, a volume distribution of holes. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 113(3):209–259, 1990.

[2] G. Allaire. Homogenization of the Navier-Stokes equations in open sets perforated with tiny holes. II. Noncritical sizes of the holes for a volume distribution and a surface distribution of holes. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 113(3):261–298, 1990.

[3] G. Allaire. Homogenization of the Navier-Stokes equations with a slip boundary condition. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 44(6):605–641, 1991.

[4] A. Bendali, M. Fares, E. Piot, and S. Tordeux. Mathematical justification of the Rayleigh conductivity model for perforated plates in acoustics. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 73(1):438–459, 2013.

[5] V. Bonnaillie-Noël, C. Lacave, and N. Masmoudi. Permeability through a perforated domain for the incompressible 2D Euler equations. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 32(1):159–182, 2015.

[6] M. Borsuk and V. Kondratiev. *Elliptic boundary value problems of second order in piecewise smooth domains*, volume 69 of *North-Holland Mathematical Library*. Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam, 2006.

[7] G. Cardone, S. A. Nazarov, and J. Sokolowski. Asymptotics of solutions of the Neumann problem in a domain with closely posed components of the boundary. *Asymptot. Anal.*, 62(1-2):41–88, 2009.

[8] D. Cioranescu and F. Murat. Un terme étrange venu d'ailleurs. In *Nonlinear partial differential equations and their applications. Collège de France Seminar, Vol. II (Paris, 1979/1980)*, volume 60 of *Res. Notes in Math.*, pages 98–138, 389–390. Pitman, Boston, Mass., 1982.

[9] C. Conca. Étude d'un fluide traversant une paroi perforée. I. Comportement limite près de la paroi. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 66(1):1–43, 1987.

[10] C. Conca. Étude d'un fluide traversant une paroi perforée. II. Comportement limite loin de la paroi. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 66(1):45–70, 1987.

[11] J. I. Díaz. Two problems in homogenization of porous media. In *Proceedings of the Second International Seminar on Geometry, Continua and Microstructure (Getafe, 1998)*, volume 14, pages 141–155, 1999.

[12] J. Diaz-Alban and N. Masmoudi. Asymptotic analysis of acoustic waves in a porous medium: initial layers in time. *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 10(1):239–265, 2012.

[13] G. P. Galdi. *An introduction to the mathematical theory of the Navier-Stokes equations*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, New York, second edition, 2011. Steady-state problems.

[14] D. Gérard-Varet and C. Lacave. The Two-Dimensional Euler Equations on Singular Domains. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 209(1):131–170, 2013.

[15] D. Gérard-Varet and C. Lacave. The Two-Dimensional Euler Equations on Singular Exterior Domains. *To appear in Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 2015.

[16] D. Iftimie, M. C. Lopes Filho, and H. J. Nussenzveig Lopes. Two dimensional incompressible ideal flow around a small obstacle. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 28(1-2):349–379, 2003.

[17] K. Kikuchi. Exterior problem for the two-dimensional Euler equation. *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math.*, 30(1):63–92, 1983.

[18] V. A. Kozlov, V. G. Maz′ya, and J. Rossmann. *Spectral problems associated with corner singularities of solutions to elliptic equations*, volume 85 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.

[19] C. Lacave. Two dimensional incompressible ideal flow around a thin obstacle tending to a curve. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 26(4):1121–1148, 2009.

[20] C. Lacave. Uniqueness for two-dimensional incompressible ideal flow on singular domains. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 47(2):1615–1664, 2015.

[21] C. Lacave, M. C. Lopes Filho, and H. J. Nussenzveig Lopes. Asymptotic behavior of 2d incompressible ideal flow around small disks. In progress, 2015.

[22] C. Lacave and A. Mazzucato. The vanishing viscosity limit in the presence of a porous medium. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.06554*, 2015.

[23] P.-L. Lions. *Mathematical topics in fluid mechanics. Vol. 1*, volume 3 of *Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications*. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1996. Incompressible models, Oxford Science Publications.

[24] P.-L. Lions and N. Masmoudi. Une approche locale de la limite incompressible. (french) [a local approach to the incompressible limit]. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 329(5):387–392, 1999.

[25] P.-L. Lions and N. Masmoudi. Homogenization of the Euler system in a 2D porous medium. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 84(1):1–20, 2005.
[26] M. C. Lopes Filho. Vortex dynamics in a two-dimensional domain with holes and the small obstacle limit. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 39(2):422–436 (electronic), 2007.
[27] N. Masmoudi. Homogenization of the compressible Navier-Stokes equations in a porous medium. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 8:885–906 (electronic), 2002. A tribute to J. L. Lions.
[28] N. Masmoudi. Some uniform elliptic estimates in a porous medium. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 339(12):849–854, 2004.
[29] A. Mikelić. Homogenization of nonstationary Navier-Stokes equations in a domain with a grained boundary. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 158:167–179, 1991.
[30] A. Mikelić and L. Paoli. Homogenization of the inviscid incompressible fluid flow through a 2D porous medium. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 127(7):2019–2028, 1999.
[31] A. Munnier and K. Ramdani. Asymptotic analysis of a neumann problem in a domain with cusp. application to the collision problem of rigid bodies in a perfect fluid. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1405.5446*, 2014.
[32] E. Sánchez-Palencia. *Nonhomogeneous media and vibration theory*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1980.
[33] E. Sánchez-Palencia. Boundary value problems in domains containing perforated walls. In *Nonlinear partial differential equations and their applications. Collège de France Seminar, Vol. III (Paris, 1980/1981)*, volume 70 of *Res. Notes in Math.*, pages 309–325. Pitman, Boston, Mass., 1982.
[34] L. Tartar. Incompressible fluid flow in a porous medium: convergence of the homogenization process. *in Nonhomogeneous media and vibration theory (E. Sánchez-Palencia)*, pages 368–377, 1980.
[35] W. Wolibner. Un theorème sur l'existence du mouvement plan d'un fluide parfait, homogène, incompressible, pendant un temps infiniment long. *Math. Z.*, 37(1):698–726, 1933.
[36] V. I. Yudovič. Non-stationary flows of an ideal incompressible fluid. *Ž. Vyčisl. Mat. i Mat. Fiz.*, 3:1032–1066, 1963.

(C. Lacave) Univ Paris Diderot, Sorbonne Paris Cité, Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu-Paris Rive Gauche, UMR 7586, CNRS, Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, F-75013, Paris, France.
E-mail address: christophe.lacave@imj-prg.fr

(N. Masmoudi) Courant Institute, 251 Mercer St., New York, NY 10012, U.S.A.
E-mail address: masmoudi@cims.nyu.edu